

AA0004096053



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

of California  
Regional  
Facility

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation







DEMOSTHENES DEMOBILISED.







*Photo]*

*[Stearn*

VISCOUNT JELlicoe and EARL HAIG BEING MADE HONORARY MEMBERS  
OF THE SOCIETY, MAY 18TH, 1920. (See page 94.)



# DEMOSTHENES DEMOBILISED

A Record of Cambridge Union  
Society Debates

February, 1919—June, 1920

*By the*

FOUR PRESIDENTS

With a Preface by

THE RT. HON. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, M.P.

And an Introduction by

DR. J. R. TANNER (St. John's)

CAMBRIDGE :  
W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.

1920



R<sub>L</sub>

PN  
4191  
G8C14

## Foreword.

THE purpose of this book is to give a permanent record of one of the most interesting periods in the history of the Union Society. To the general reader these pages will be but the dull record of dull debates. "Who cares," he will say, "what the Cambridge Union thinks about anything?" Mere publication will be counted as presumption. Let us forestall such criticism by agreeing with it; but we must add that we believe the presumption of youth to be its greatest weakness and its greatest asset. This is not a text-book of politics, and those who expect instruction or illumination on present problems will be sorely disappointed. To those, however, who have the interests of the Union at heart, we hope this little book will appeal. The Union debates supply for many of us a form of social contract by which we gladly suffer fools to teach themselves to speak, if they, in their turn, will suffer our foolishness with the same measure of gladness. Few of us who have broken the silence will ever forget how painfully we collated arguments and framed them in the grand rhetorical form; how anxiously we sought the president's eye; how fearfully we caught it; how nervously we arose to speak, forgot everything we had prepared, stuttered something visibly soporific and unquestionably irrelevant, and sat down with relief and confusion. Still, we had spoken, perhaps might never speak again, but we had given to the debate, as it were, some of our personality, and had received in exchange some degree of confidence for future occasions. To all such, we offer this record without further apology. For the sake of convenience, each of the four Presidents has written his own impression of those debates over which he presided, a fact which may account for any divergence of political opinion.

All profits arising from the sale of this book will be devoted to the Pension Fund for the Staff of the Society.

In conclusion, something must be said of the general and financial position of the Society. From January 1919 to June 1920, the period under review, 1,825 new members

were enrolled, a number three times as large as the previous record for the corresponding period. During these five terms, an overdraft of £4,400 was converted into a credit balance of £3,200, due largely to the popularity of the debates and to the generosity of past members, who subscribed over £1,800 to the War Debt Fund. We cannot end without expressing the debt of gratitude we owe to the Treasurer, Dr. J. E. McTaggart (Trinity), Mr. B. G. Brown (Trinity), Librarian, Mr. E. Bullough (Gonville and Caius), Steward, and to the Rev. J. K. Mozley (Pembroke), all of whom, assisted by the untiring energy of Mr. Stanley Brown, the Chief Clerk, presided over the destinies of the Society during the difficult times of the war.

We wish also to tender our warmest thanks to two very distinguished former officers of the Society: to the Rt. Hon. Austen Chamberlain, M.P. (Trinity), who has so graciously favoured us with an introduction, and to Dr. J. R. Tanner (St. John's) for his sketch of the history of the Society. We feel that these two contributions have entirely justified the publication of this book.

W. L. M.  
J. W. M.  
G. H. S.  
D. M. R.

# Preface

BY

THE RIGHT HON. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, M.P.

IT must be admitted that Reports of Debates are at best poor reading, and when these Reports are necessarily reduced to a brief summary in the third person, the last hope of tracing the personality of the speaker and of recovering something of the effect which he produced on his audience disappears from the printed word. Here and there an orator survives in the pages of Hansard. Disraeli's philippics against Peel can still be read with interest, and Bright's lofty flights of eloquence during the Crimean War are perhaps even more moving when read than they were to his hearers. For I have heard it said on the authority of a contemporary that the listeners were unable to abandon themselves to the enjoyment of the orator's eloquence from fear lest one ill-chosen word should bring him crashing to the ground. "The Angel of Death has been abroad throughout the land. You can almost hear the beating of his wings," quoted this eyewitness. "Just think," he continued, "if Bright had said *flapping!* We were so strained that we should have burst into half hysterical laughter." But be this as it may, who can now read Gladstone's speeches with pleasure? Who can trace in the three volumes of the Midlothian Campaign or in the countless columns of Hansard the ineluctable charm, the infinite variety, the inspiration, the passion, the grim, sardonic humour which dominated the House of Commons and swept the country time and again? How can the printed word recall the face, the figure, the gesture, the voice, each changing with the changing mood of the speaker—how reproduce the electrical atmosphere, the fierce sympathies and still fiercer antagonisms surging among the audience and acting and reacting on speaker and listeners alike? Memory may do something, but the orator, like the actor, must be content to leave a memory only. His art dies with him.

If this be true of even the fullest reports and of the greatest speeches, it must be even more true of such short records as are included in this volume. Yet old members



of the Union will welcome it for the sake of the vitality which it shows in a Society to which many of us owe a great debt, and for the evidence which it affords of the vigorous rebirth of the Society after the gloomy solitude of war.

And to men engaged in public affairs or concerned to measure intelligently the formation of opinion in the coming generation, the book has another and a vital interest. Here are gathered brief records of the thoughts and aspirations of Cambridge men of to-day, but not, as normally, of men whose only experience is drawn from schools and colleges, and for whom the world is but just opening. Here we have a record of thought bred or ripened amidst the perils of the North Sea, in the trenches of France and Flanders or under Eastern skies. The speakers may be for the most part little older than their predecessors, but they have an experience not to be measured by years, which gives a value to this record of a year's debates to which no other period in the Society's history could lay claim.

What does this young generation which has fought and suffered, which has at least come to manhood in the dread years of war, think of our old problems and of the struggles which before the war were so engrossing to us? How do they regard the problems of to-day, and, still more, the problems of to-morrow? What hope have they of the world? What promise do they unfold to it?

The reader who will take the trouble to run through these pages will find the answers to these questions. Heaven forbid that youth should always count the cost of every new adventure, or even concern itself too nicely with the practical difficulties of ambitious schemes of reformation. We all grow conservative with age—most of all, the man who is most consistent with himself. Youth is the time for high hopes and soaring ambitions, for clear-cut distinctions and holy abhorrence of compromise. Time will bring only too soon the recognition of the vast gulf that lies between theory and practice, the spirit of caution and the wise opportunism which are needed in the government of men. But to me, hastily turning over these pages, there seem to pervade them a greater sobriety of judgment, and a more serious appreciation of the importance of the problems attacked than was common to my own untried generation. And as I ponder these debates and attempt

to measure the forces at work in the Young England of to-day I seem to find a fresh assurance of the strength of our political institutions and a new guarantee of the ordered progress of our land.

AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,

WHITEHALL.

*29th September, 1920.*

# Introduction

BY

J. R. TANNER, LITT.D. (St. John's).

As I was Treasurer of the Union for the twelve years before the war, the Editors of this volume have invited me to write a short sketch of the Society's hundred years of history, and to express any views which I may entertain concerning the changes effected in its external relations and inner spirit by the enormous experience through which the younger generation of Cambridge men has lately passed.

The Society was founded by the union of three other societies in 1815, and but for the war there would have been centenary celebrations. These were to include an extension of premises in Round Church Street, where suitable property had been already acquired. The scheme provided improved accommodation for the commissariat, to replace the present makeshift Luncheon and Dining Room—obtained by the conversion of the old Writing Room to other uses—and the inconvenient Kitchen, acquired by the appropriation of certain mysterious spaces in the roof which once did duty as a smoking room. The war had the effect of saddling the Society with a debt equal to the cost of the extension, but without any buildings to shew for it, although by unexpected good fortune the Society's remarkable recovery after the war has extinguished this liability and has once more replaced Union finances upon a sound footing.

The three distinguished men who carried through the amalgamation of 1815 were Henry Bickersteth, of Caius, afterwards Lord Langdale, who was Senior Wrangler and first Smith's Prizeman in 1808, and in 1836 became Master of the Rolls ; Sir Edward Hall Alderson, also of Caius, who was Senior Wrangler, first Smith's Prizeman, and first Chancellor's Medallist in 1809, and became in 1830 a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, and in 1834 a Baron of the Exchequer ; and Sir Jonathan Frederick Pollock, of Trinity, Senior Wrangler and first Smith's Prizeman in 1806, and Chief Baron of the Exchequer 1844-66. Thus the Union owes everything to lawyer-mathematicians.

The first debate was held on Monday, February 20, 1815, in what Lord Houghton afterwards described as "a low, ill-ventilated, ill-lit gallery at the back of the Red Lion Inn [in Petty Cury]—cavernous, tavernous—something between a commercial room and a district branch meeting house." This indifferent accommodation served until about 1832, when the Society moved into a building specially erected for it, behind what used to be the Hoop Hotel. This building is now in the occupation of the A.D.C. In 1850 there was another move—to a "dingy old room in Green Street," formerly a Wesleyan Chapel—and here the debates were carried on until the opening of the older part of the present buildings behind the Round Church on October 30, 1866. The latest enlargement, which included a new Library, Drawing Room, and Smoking Room, was opened on February 24, 1886.

The first President of the Society was Edward John Gambier, of Trinity, afterwards Fellow; he was knighted in 1834, and was Chief Justice of Madras 1842-9. The second was Constantine Henry Phipps, Lord Normanby, of Trinity, the eldest son of the Earl of Mulgrave; he was Lord Privy Seal under Lord Melbourne, and afterwards Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and was created first Marquis of Normanby in 1838. The third was the Hon. Charles John Shore, of Trinity, the eldest son of the first Lord Teignmouth; he represented Marylebone in the House of Commons from 1838 to 1841. For the first four years of the Society's existence the officers all came either from Trinity or St. John's, but in October, 1819, Sidney Sussex succeeded in capturing an office, and from that time onward they were shared in no unequal proportion to the size of the foundations. Macaulay was Secretary in the Easter Term of 1820, and Treasurer in the Lent Term of 1823, but he was never President. Lord Lytton said of his speech on the French Revolution that it was "the greatest display of eloquence" which he witnessed at the Union. "It still lingers in my recollection," he wrote, "as the most heart-stirring effort of that true oratory which seizes hold of the passions, transports you from yourself, and identifies you with the very life of the orator, that it has ever been my lot to hear, saving, perhaps, a speech delivered by Mr. O'Connell to an immense crowd in the open air. Macaulay, in point of passion, power, and effect, never equalled that speech in his best days in the House of Commons." Lord

Lytton himself, as E. G. L. Bulwer, of Trinity Hall, was Secretary in the Easter Term, 1824, and Treasurer in the following Michaelmas Term. Among earlier Presidents were Alexander Cockburn, of Trinity Hall, who presided over the Tichborne Trial as Lord Chief Justice of England; Benjamin Hall Kennedy, of St. John's, the famous Head Master of Shrewsbury, and afterwards Regius Professor of Greek; Richard Chenevix Trench, of Trinity, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin; Henry Alford, of Trinity, Dean of Canterbury 1857-71; and Charles John Ellicott, of St. John's, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

The present volume begins with the Suggestion Book. This institution is not, as has been supposed, co-eval with the foundation of the Society, but begins "about the Easter Term, 1856." It is not without interest to observe that on the first page of the first volume the note is struck, which has reverberated for more than half-a-century. A member complains: "The iron railing to the gallery is very hard; if it were *padded* it would serve instead of sofas." The Vice-President replies: "It is suggested that the honourable member's *coat* should be padded instead." And this frivolity dates back to the dignified days of the Crimean War!

When the Society's debates came to an end during the war it was commonly supposed that this was the first interruption in recorded history. It was, however, the case that from 1817 to 1821 debates were prohibited by the Vice-Chancellor, mainly on the ground that they interfered with reading. There was also some trouble over the introduction of politics, and when permission was given for debates to be resumed it was subject to the condition that all political questions later than 1800 should be excluded. This limitation produced the state of things described by Lord Houghton from his earlier memories: "We got fervent upon the character of Lord North, and fierce upon the policy of Cardinal Richelieu." The Society was, however, accustomed to run it rather fine. It decided that "the principles of the French Revolution were deserving of approbation," and that "the conduct of Mr. Pitt, *as far as the year 1800*, was far more deserving of the approbation of posterity than that of Mr. Fox." There were also ways of getting round the prohibition, for a good deal of nineteenth century declamation could be introduced into a debate on a motion that "the political conduct of



Oliver Cromwell was beneficial to the country"; and Lord Houghton used to explain how the question of women's suffrage was once smuggled into the House under cover of an innocent discussion of "The Comparative Merits of Adam and Eve."

After reading the abstracts of post war debates printed below, the question inevitably arises how far and in what direction their character has changed. We must take as our "datum line," if so topical a term may be permitted, the famous debate at Oxford on November 26, 1829, upon the motion "That Shelley was a greater poet than Byron." The deputation from Cambridge consisted of Lord Houghton, then Richard Monckton Milnes, Thomas Sunderland, and Arthur Hallam, the friend of Tennyson. The supporters of Shelley drove in a postchaise to Oxford, where they were entertained by Milnes Gaskell, by Sir Francis Doyle, afterwards Professor of Poetry at Oxford, and "by a young student of the name of Gladstone." One of the Oxford speakers was Cardinal Manning, from whom comes the only account of the debate we possess. The Oxford speakers were, "precise, orderly, and morbidly afraid of excess in word or manner. The Cambridge oratory came in like a flood into a mill-pond. Both Monckton Milnes and Arthur Hallam took us aback by the boldness and freedom of their manner; but I remember the effect of Sunderland's declamation and action to this day. It had never been seen or heard before among us; we cowered like birds and ran like sheep." The oratory that came like a flood into a mill-pond and depended upon declamation and action must have been a survival of the tradition of Macaulay, and it was soon to become out of date. The middle period of the century, which produced presidents like Professor Hort, Professor Henry Sidgwick, and Sir John Gorst, is not likely to have depended on declamation, although Maitland, who belonged to a later decade, was not only a brilliant and witty speaker, but could become on occasion a most moving orator. Nor do Sir Charles Dilke, Sir William Harcourt, Professor Fawcett, or Mr. Justice Stephen suggest appeals to the emotions. The son of the last named, J. K. Stephen of King's, who occupied a unique position in my own time, was both brilliant and profound, but his effectiveness depended little upon action, and still less upon declamation. The Union tradition of the eighties was one of

solidity and soberness, and it is said that blue-books were introduced in debate. A proposer who incurred damaging criticism, did not invent facts for his speech in reply, or ride off in a cloud of amusing irrelevances, but repaired to the Library, and dug out fresh material.

It has been said that with the new century speakers displayed more intellectual agility, but were less careful and solidly argumentative ; that the note of cynicism was more often heard ; that the House, eager for amusement, was more tolerant than heretofore of mere flippancy. Critics nurtured in the older tradition complained that the debates were getting frothy. I think that there may have been something in these criticisms in so far as they applied to the general tone, but I am convinced that the standard of the best Union speaking was well maintained. It may be that members who in an earlier generation would have been content to be merely dull, now strove unsuccessfully to be funny, and that clever members were betrayed into flippancies and insincerities ; but I have heard speeches quite as able, as well-informed, and as brilliantly argued in the last days before the war, as any that belong to the close of the Victorian age. A sound tradition flourished, in the main unimpaired, and moulded into the old attractive form both the thought and the expression of the ablest men.

The abstract of speeches printed below suggest on the one hand that the Union tradition has survived the war, and on the other that the experience of realities gained in the war has brought about a revival of ancient virtues. There has been no reversion to the period of declamatory gesticulation, but sincerity, sobriety, and solid argument have, I think, re-established their old position in Union debates. A real desire to get to the heart of things has expelled the ambition to make out a plausible case. Flippancy and dullness will never be entirely banished from public speaking, but they are alien to the general tone of the House. The Union has always been tolerant to individuals, and especially to new speakers, but it can exercise a gentle and beneficent discipline, or it would not continue to be the great school of speaking that it is. We are still gloomily reckoning up the losses of the war, but the appearance in Cambridge of Demosthenes Demobilised may be counted one of its solid gains.

The appreciations of individual speakers which appear

below are written for encouragement, and the note of sustained eulogy which runs through them is itself the result of a tradition. At one time the publication of any report of the debates or criticism of the speakers was a breach of the privileges of the House, and the member supplying them was liable to a fine. But the appearance of a regular University journal—*The Cambridge Review*—in 1879 eventually led to a relaxation of the rule, and criticisms of the speakers began to appear. As there was still some uncertainty about the attitude of the Union authorities, the Editors appear to have adopted a policy of judicious lubrication, and the standard, once set, was difficult to depart from. The same line was followed by other journals, and one appreciation of a speaker who varied his dullness with fatuous jesting, ran (if memory serves) as follows: "The profound and subtle logic of the honourable member's argument was from time to time enlivened by brilliant flashes of wit." The tradition still holds, and no one will quarrel with that kindness of heart and desire to encourage merit which make a departure from it impossible. Let us not quench the smoking flax!

An entry in the Union records links up the present enterprise with the Society's earliest days. On Monday, March 24, 1817, "Mr. Whewell, of Trinity," opened his first debate on the question, "Is the increased attention which has been paid to our Army likely to have a good effect upon society?" The Union of that day thought not. Perhaps Demosthenes Demobilised may take a different view.

J. R. TANNER.

ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,

1 October, 1920.



## SUMMARY OF DEBATES.

### The Government.

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>For. Against. Page</i>		
11 MAR. 1919	CONFIDENCE IN COALITION GOVERNMENT - - - - -	121	83	6
2 DEC. 1919	CONFIDENCE IN COALITION GOVERNMENT - - - - -	205	141	43
9 MAR. 1920	CONFIDENCE IN COALITION GOVERNMENT - - - - -	178	196	71
8 JUNE 1920	APPEAL TO ELECTORATE - - - - -	129	135	92

### Empire, Army, Navy.

11 FEB. 1919	EXTENSION OF BRITISH EMPIRE -	51	74	5
25 FEB. 1919	SUPREME BRITISH NAVY AS BEST GUARANTEE OF UNIVERSAL PEACE	91	101	6
18 NOV. 1919	REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURE ON ARMAMENTS - - - - -	214	178	38
17 FEB. 1920	COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING -	47	114	62
29 APRIL 1919	IMPERIAL FEDERATION - - - - -	89	59	7
1 JUNE 1920	DOMINION HOME RULE FOR INDIA -	82	83	90

### Foreign Politics.

21 OCT. 1919	LEAGUE OF NATIONS - - - - -	723	280	26
25 NOV. 1919	INTERVENTION IN RUSSIA - - - - -	132	218	41
20 JAN. 1920	AMERICA'S ACTION TOWARDS PEACE TREATY - - - - -	117	229	52
27 APRIL 1920	FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH GERMANY	122	75	79
11 MAY 1920	GOVERNMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY -	87	115	85
6 MAY 1919	HANG THE KAISER - - - - -	79	209	9

### Ireland.

13 MAY 1919	CONDEMN GOVERNMENT'S INACTION -	94	58	11
27 JAN. 1920	GOVERNMENT'S IRISH PROPOSALS -	197	131	54

### Liberalism.

3 JUNE 1919	RETURN TO PRINCIPLES OF LIBERALISM	115	240	18
10 FEB. 1920	PRE-WAR LIBERAL POLICY - - - - -	441	316	59

### Labour Questions.

4 FEB. 1919	SELF-GOVERNING GUILDS - - - - -	80	43	5
4 MAR. 1919	NATIONALISATION OF MINES AND RAILWAYS - - - - -	41	74	6
20 MAY 1919	WHITLEY REPORT - - - - -	126	88	14
14 OCT. 1919	TENDENCIES OF LABOUR ARE DANGEROUS	242	190	23
3 FEB. 1920	NATIONALISATION OF MINES - - - - -	105	148	57
24 FEB. 1920	LABOUR GOVERNMENT - - - - -	265	651	64
25 MAY 1920	CO-PARTNERSHIP - - - - -	92	51	88



## SUMMARY OF DEBATES

## Various Political Subjects.

<i>Date.</i>		<i>Subject.</i>				<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>	<i>Page</i>
28	OCT. 1919	PROHIBITION	-	-	-	182	205	31
4	NOV. 1919	PARTY SYSTEM	-	-	-	137	155	33
4	MAY 1920	FREEDOM OF SPEECH	-	-	-	97	84	81
11	NOV. 1919	CAPITAL LEVY	-	-	-	123	135	35
27	MAY 1919	REFORM OF DIVORCE LAWS	-	-	-	145	38	16

## Academic Subjects.

18	FEB. 1919	A UTILITARIAN UNIVERSITY	-	-	-	46	102	6
2	MAR. 1920	THE MODERN NOVEL	-	-	-	178	123	68
18	MAY 1920	ADMISSION OF WOMEN TO UNIVERSITY	-	-	-	365	266	86

## THE SUGGESTION BOOK.

This is a great institution in the Society. Its chief function is to take the place of question-time at debates ; its chief use is to provide an opportunity for members who desire to be facetious, or who have a brain-wave, or nurse a grievance ; its chief result is to exasperate an already over-worked (?) Vice-President, and to interest visitors to the Society who disport themselves so graciously as to be blind to some of the shortcomings in humour, and amused where traces of it exist.

The following are a few extracts at random from recent pages. The replies are written by the Vice-President.

*Suggestion.* That less rot be written in this book.

*Reply.* The Vice-President thanks the hon. member for his sympathy, and notes that "They ne'er pardon who have done the wrong."

\* \* \*

*Suggestion.* That the date-calendar in the Writing Room be either (1) occasionally corrected, or (2) removed.

*Reply.* The Vice-President will take the first alternative as his ideal.

\* \* \*

*Suggestion.* That the present Vice-President, in taking leave of this book, be less lugubrious than the last.

*Reply.* And more accurate than the hon. member. The last Vice-President was almost jocund, and, even if he were not, the retiring Vice-President is entitled to the sweet sorrow of parting.

\* \* \*

*Suggestion.* That the Vice-President paint the lily of his perfect speech overleaf by praying nightly that Heaven may ever spare this House the chatter of women and all such encroachment in spheres where, in the nature of things, they are not intended to be, however sweet, lovely and adorable we find them in our homes.

*Reply.* The Vice-President approves the lofty sentiment, and quotes :—

“ If stars descended to earth’s shore,  
How could they so our wonder move?  
How still could shine upon the floor  
Girton all glorious above? ”

[The question of the admission of women to the floor of the House for debates had been raised. They are allowed to be present as Visitors in the Gallery.]

\* \* \*

[A clerical error produced the following.]

*Suggestion.* That, in view of the present shortage of days in the year, the Society should discontinue the practice of holding Private Business Meetings on the 30th February.

*Reply.* It is now seven years since the 30th of February appeared in the Calendar of the House. This is apparently a septennial event, or some new kind of Leap year. But the hon. member need not fear that Pope Gregory XIII. will turn in his grave. It has been decided to hold the Private Business Meeting on Monday, 1st March.

\* \* \*

*Suggestion.* That meals should be allowed to be put down.

*Reply.* The Vice-President hopes that they are. It would be a pity for the converse to take place. But with regard to the question of credit, this has been decided to be impracticable.

\* \* \*

*Suggestion.* That the various clocks in the Society’s rooms be made synchronous.

*Reply.* The clocks, like the members of the Society, being of different ages, go at various speeds.

\* \* \*

*Suggestion.* That the Vice-President reply to some of these suggestions, etc.

*Reply.* Noted. If hon. members will cease to play the part of a Sphinx proposing roadside riddles, the Vice-President, a dull dog withal, will require less time to excogitate his replies.

\* \* \*

At the end of each term the retiring Vice-President writes some remark of farewell to his contributors and correspondents. One such was done in the following way. In the suggestion column the Vice-President wrote :—

“Get you gone! Give way to honester men,” and signed it O. Cromwell, Sidney Sussex.

The Vice-President wrote underneath: “The Vice-President leaves the answering of this suggestion to the discretion of his successor. Farewell.”

## Lent Term, 1919.

When the Armistice was signed to the accompaniment of appropriate liveliness in Cambridge, no one could have imagined that, within a few months, the University would have expelled its military invaders and once more been thronged with its normal population. Yet the Lent Term, 1919, saw unexpected numbers back in residence. All the old institutions began to stir restlessly and to awake from their enforced sleep. The Union, which, since the beginning of 1916, had been kept alive, and little more, by the untiring efforts of a provisional committee of ex-presidents in residence, soon began to look forward to the time when the debates, always a central feature of the Society, should be resumed. The difficulties of restarting were considerable. The old line of tradition was almost completely broken. Very few who knew the practice and procedure of Union debates were available in residence. However, feeling that a resumption of debates would be welcomed, the Rev. J. K. Mozley (ex-President, Pembroke), who has long been one of the mainstays of the Society, made a start, after numerous disappointments, with a discussion on the none too promising subject of Guild Socialism.

Though few knew clearly what the motion meant, when once the ice was broken the debate went well, and for the rest of the term there was no difficulty in finding speakers anxious to voice their opinions. The attendance throughout was markedly good, and for many months the Union provided one of the few arenas in the country in which it was possible to discuss matters of public interest in an open and untrammelled manner. Writing at this date it is somewhat difficult to recall the excitement and even indignation with which any but the most orthodox views were greeted. The Paris Conference was pictured as waiting expectantly for news to be flashed across the wires that the Cambridge Union had refused to support the Prime Minister on some term of the Peace Settlement. However flattering such an estimate of the importance of the Society's proceedings might be—and it will be no breach of confidence for us to say that at least on one occasion the Society was approached by a certain party in one of the smaller Allied Powers for an expression of opinion—it did



not simplify the task of choosing a middle line between motions which were merely dull and those which were provocative.

No detailed account of the first term's debates will be given here owing to the restrictions of space. A list of the motions, however, with the results of the division, may be of interest as showing the feelings of that section of the University which habitually attended. When it is remembered that the bulk of those voting had only just been demobilised from the Services, some of the results will appear sufficiently striking. During this term the affairs of the Society were managed as before by the Provisional Committee, while the debates were presided over by a nominated chairman. At the conclusion, the usual election of officers and committee was resumed after having been in abeyance for over three years.

#### PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE.

*Chairman* : Rev. J. K. Mozley, B.D. (Pembroke)

*Treasurer* : Mr. J. E. McTaggart, Litt.D. (Trinity)

*Librarian* : Mr. B. G. Brown, M.A. (Trinity)

*Steward* : Mr. E. Bullough, M.A. (Gonville and Caius)

*Chairman of Debates* : Mr. W. L. McNair (Ex-Secretary,  
Gonville and Caius)

#### LIST OF MOTIONS FOR DEBATE AND RESULTS.

FEBRUARY 4th, 1919 : "*That the menaced liberty of England must be secured by Self-Governing Guilds within the State.*"

*Ayes*—Rev. R. M. Pattison-Muir (ex-President, Gonville and Caius).

*Noes*—Mr. Hugh Dalton (King's), Mr. H. B. Davies (Pembroke).

Division :—*Ayes*, 80 ; *Noes*, 43. Motion won by 37 votes.

FEBRUARY 11th : "*That this House would deprecate any material extension of the British Empire.*"

*Ayes*—Mr. G. F. Johnson (King's), Mr. C. D. B. Ellis (King's).

*Noes*—Mr. L. B. Charles (Trinity), Mr. E. Herbert (Trinity).

Division :—*Ayes*, 74 ; *Noes*, 51. Motion won by 23 votes.

FEBRUARY 18th : "*That in the opinion of this House it would be a disaster if the University were ever to become utilitarian in its objects.*"

*Ayes*—Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's), Mr. S. C. Roberts (ex-Librarian, Pembroke).

*Noes*—Mr. N. G. Dunning (Peterhouse), Mr. W. F. Reddaway (King's, Censor of Fitzwilliam Hall).

Division :—*Ayes*, 102 ; *Noes*, 46. Motion won by 56 votes.

FEBRUARY 25th : "*That in the opinion of this House a supreme British Navy is the best guarantee of Universal Peace.*"

*Ayes*—Lieut. D. T. C. Field, R.N. (Emmanuel), Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel).

*Noes*—Mr. I. David (St. John's), Mr. A. Schofield (Gonville and Caius).

Division :—*Ayes*, 91 ; *Noes*, 101. Motion lost by 10 votes.

MARCH 4th : "*That this House would welcome the Nationalisation of Mines and Railways.*"

*Ayes*—Mr. G. L. Jones (Emmanuel), Mr. J. H. Barnes (St. John's).

*Noes*—Mr. H. V. F. Barran (Trinity), Mr. A. C. Thompson (Trinity Hall).

Division :—*Ayes*, 41 ; *Noes*, 74. Motion lost by 33 votes.

MARCH 11th : "*That this House desires to express its confidence in the ability of His Majesty's Government to conduct the Foreign and Domestic affairs of the Empire.*"

*Ayes*—Mr. Ernest Evans (ex-President, Trinity Hall), Mr. T. A. Lewis, M.P. (Pontypridd).

*Noes*—Mr. Raglan Somerset (Queens'), Mr. J. H. B. Nihill, M.C. (ex-President, Emmanuel).

Division :—*Ayes*, 121 ; *Noes*, 83. Motion won by 38 votes.

## Easter Term, 1919.

### OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE.

- President* : W. L. McNair (Gonville and Caius).  
*Vice-President* : J. W. Morris (Trinity Hall).  
*Treasurer* : J. E. McTaggart, Litt.D. (Trinity).  
*Librarian* : B. G. Brown, M.A. (Trinity).  
*Steward* : E. Bullough, M.A. (Gonville and Caius).  
*Secretary* : C. D. B. Ellis (King's).  
*Standing Committee* : A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's).  
I. David (St. John's).  
G. F. Johnson (King's).  
J. H. Barnes (St. John's).  
D. M. Reid (Emmanuel).  
A. C. Thompson (Trinity Hall).

APRIL 29th, 1919.

*Motion* : "That this House would welcome the adoption of a system of Imperial Federation."

The presence of an exceptional number of men from Overseas rendered this debate more than usually interesting. Though the motion did not lend itself to light and scintillating treatment, the substance of the speeches was throughout uncommonly good, and the interest was well maintained to the end. The opinion of the representatives of the Colonies—(no offence is meant, though it is sometimes taken in the use of this term instead of the more cumbrous "self-governing dominions beyond the seas")—was almost equally divided. The House appeared to be more in contact with realities than is usual when dealing with problems of Imperial policy.

Mr. C. N. THOMPSON (St. John's), in opening, outlined a thoroughly constructive scheme, having as its main idea the erection of a central assembly with elected representatives from all parts of the Empire, with sovereign power to decide questions of war and peace for the whole Commonwealth. Such an assembly would check the separatist movement, of which the proposer had had experience in South Africa, and would enable the Empire to make full use of the best brains from Overseas, which, in the emergency of the war, had rendered such invaluable service.

Mr. J. H. BARNES (St. John's) declared that the proposed federation lacked the fundamental requirements of federalism—contiguity and the desire to federate. The geographical dispersion and disparity of population precluded any idea of adequate and efficient representation, while the delicately balanced peace of the world would be threatened by any future centralisation and consolidation. The natural process was exactly contrary to that proposed by the motion. Imperial policy must aim at extending step by step the self-governing powers of the constituent parts.

Mr. C. R. FAY (Christ's) developed still further his leader's scheme of federation. The experience of 1914 demonstrated that the outlying parts of the Empire must have a voice on the issues of peace and war. A central representative assembly only could deal adequately with questions of Imperial defence and allocate the burden to be borne by each part. Problems of labour, industry and immigration required the same treatment. Mr. Fay is always forcible and illuminating, and was on strong ground when he declared that the successful federation of the divergent nationalities within the Empire would afford the best proof of the possibility of nations living together in amity.

Mr. A. C. THOMPSON (Trinity Hall) maintained that the present system of Imperial conferences provided sufficient co-ordination and obviated any possibility of grave dissension. Even under the closer union it was inconceivable that force would ever be used to coerce a recalcitrant member, while conflicting interests and divergencies of policy would be accentuated.

Mr. J. W. MORRIS (Vice-President, Trinity Hall) saw in federation the natural organic evolution from the present system. In the Imperial assembly the forces of order would find rallying points to enable them to defeat the elements of disruption.

Mr. J. B. CONDLIFFE (Gonville and Caius) expressed a fear that federation would minimize rather than increase the power of self-government at present enjoyed, and predicted that democracy, so constituted, would become an instrument of militarism—an enemy whose presence Mr. Condliffe is never slow to detect.

Lieut. FIELD, R.N. (Emmanuel) : The difficulties of federation were infinitely less than those of a League of Nations.

Mr. S. S. IMAM (Trinity) explained that the Nationalist aims of India would not be satisfied by any partial constitutional change.

Mr. G. B. HARRISON (Queens'), whilst denying the reality and sincerity of the Nationalist movements, found in federation the opportunity for British labour to realise its aims.

There also spoke in favour of the motion Mr. J. P. Milne (Trinity), Mr. V. K. Thakur (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel), and Mr. P. N. W. Strong (Selwyn), while the opposition received support from Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse), Mr. G. M. Graham (King's), Mr. G. L. Jones (Emmanuel), and Mr. J. F. A. North (Downing).

A division showed : Ayes, 89 ; Noes, 59 ; the motion being lost by 30 votes.

MAY 6th, 1919.

Motion : "*That this House neither desires to 'hang the Kaiser,' nor to 'make Germany pay.'*"

Amendment : "*To substitute does not desire for neither desires, and to delete all words after Kaiser.*"

In anticipation of an exciting evening, great numbers flocked to the Union to hear Mr. Lloyd George's election pledges challenged. Rumour was busy with reports of demonstrations and counter-demonstrations prepared for the night, but the dignity of the Society escaped unscathed, and the Press correspondent, who had reserved the use of the post office wire for flashing to the London morning papers an account of the "Great Rag at the Cambridge Union," had perforce to go away disappointed. The amendment standing in the name of Mr. H. Grose Hodge (ex-President, Pembroke), which was carried by a large majority, had the effect of confining the discussion, after the first four speakers, to a simpler issue than that presented to the electors of Cambridge a few months previously. The acquittal of the distinguished personage drew on the Society maledictions from certain anonymous correspondents, one even going so far as to condemn all those voting in the majority to the fate which they had thought unfitting for the Kaiser.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Peterhouse) disarmed all criticism by the moderation with which he opened his case. His



proposal directly challenged the general election pledges which had been extorted from the Government by the Northcliffe Press, in spite of their contravention of the terms on which Germany had submitted. An impartial tribunal pronouncing sentence would be executing the office of an Avenger and not of Justice, and at best could add little to the overwhelming punishment the victim was already enduring. Staggering indemnities could never be recovered from a bankrupt Germany, and were as undesirable as they were impracticable.

Mr. D. M. REID (Emmanuel), as the representative of the strong and sane but by no means silent man, demanded full justice in vigorous terms. Exemplary punishment of the Kaiser would stamp out Prussianism at its source. Our own history had shown that no person, however highly placed, was above the law in the case of the gravest offences. Forgiveness would be taken as a sign of weakness and lead to further excesses. Mr. Reid's concluding full-throated war-cry brought down the House.

Mr. E. HERBERT (Trinity) deprecated on the ground of expediency any exemplary punishment of either the Kaiser or Germany. The world did not want a Saint Wilhelm and an outraged Germany, but required peace to recover from the devastation of war. The amount both in money and in kind that would eventually be recovered from Germany would increase in proportion to the moderation of our demands.

Mr. A. E. CLARKE-WILLIAMS (Trinity Hall) elaborated the proposition that the satisfaction of revenge and righteous indignation was a legitimate end of punishment, and declared that the greatest security of peace was the certainty that the belligerents would suffer—particularly the losers! Germany would misunderstand magnanimity, and would merely conserve her energies *pour mieux sauter*.

By an overwhelming show of hands on the amendment, the House declared that it wished to confine its present attention to the Kaiser. There followed from Mr. H. GROSE HODGE (ex-President, Pembroke) a vigorous and eloquent speech in favour of clemency and the divine right of kings, which completely won over the House. Germany would never flout Europe unless revived by the martyrdom of the Kaiser. In conclusion, "This is no time to hand over any crowned head to the tender mercies of the proletariat."



Mr. G. H. SHAKESPEARE (Emmanuel) was not content with hanging the Kaiser, but wanted to "hang the lot."

Lieut. D. T. C. FIELD, R.N. (Emmanuel) and Mr. G. GROSE HODGE (Pembroke) both felt that, with a dead Kaiser, the world would not be disturbed by a repetition of the Hundred Days.

Mr. J. K. BOUSFIELD (Gonville and Caius) lifted the veil of secrecy from the history of the Berlin councils in August, 1914, and suggested that an Allied loan to Germany would be well repaid.

Mr. B. F. STEVENSON, U.S.A. (Sidney Sussex), delighted the House with a display of American oratory in which he portrayed, as the fittest punishment, the declining days of the Kaiser lived out amidst the scorn of the world.

"I see an old man tottering down the hillside of life supported by a broken sceptre, his proud legions scattered and defeated. Leave him to his memories."

After speeches in favour of Kaisericide from Mr. R. F. ADGIE (Clare) and Mr. S. H. BUCK (St. Catharine's), and against from Mr. C. P. BEST (Sidney) and Mr. A. S. LE MAITRE (St. John's), the House declared by 209 votes to 79 its approval of the amended motion. So ended a memorable debate.

MAY 13th, 1919.

Motion: "*That this House condemns the inaction of the Government with regard to Ireland.*"

On many historic occasions in the past, Ireland has provided an engrossing subject for Union debates, but seldom before had the condition of the "distressful" country, combined with the fluctuating policy of the Government, been so apparently hopeless. Before the war, periods of political unrest had generally coincided with times of economic distress, but on this occasion Ireland presented a picture of great commercial prosperity combined with the gravest social and political upheavals which were only the prelude for far more serious disturbances in the near future.

Mr. C. D. B. ELLIS (Secretary, King's) anticipated criticism by saying that it was not his duty to suggest a constructive solution, but merely to condemn the lack of policy in the Government. This he did with a will. The policy of coercion coerced no one. The Home Rule Act

placed on the Statute Book through funk of the Nationalists, was suspended through funk of Ulster; conscription, imposed through funk of England, was withheld through funk of Ireland. The Government throughout had blown hot and cold alternatively. Better a wrong policy energetically pursued than the right policy not persistently followed through to the end.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE (Pembroke) showed by a process of elimination that no other policy was possible. Effective repression was alien to the British nature. The Government had removed every grievance that was possible, but had failed to grant independence. To this England could never agree. Ireland, after her conduct in the war, had no right to claim treatment as a neutral. Her claim to self-determination must be postponed till the Cabinet were freed from the embarrassments of the Peace Conference. Till then inaction was the wisest policy.

Mr. C. P. BEST (Sidney Sussex) said that Ireland's distress centred in England's unflinching policy of treating her as a pawn in every Parliamentary contest. This policy was still pursued, and was fatal to the peace of Ireland. Our policy of concession when embarrassed, and repression when free from embarrassment, had justified the slogan that England's weakness was Ireland's opportunity. Ireland's claim to be heard at Paris was not unreasonable; and, even if not the ideal solution, it was at any rate a practical policy which was preferable to the vacillation of the moment.

Mr. L. B. CHARLES (Trinity) explained that the Government's present policy was to allow Irishmen of all parties and creeds to come together and work out their own solution. If any agreement was suggested, the Government would hasten to give it legislative clothing, so long as it satisfied Ireland's needs and England's honour. The House should not condemn inaction when action was impossible.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Peterhouse) then made a violent incursion into the debate with a moving description of the tragedy of the Irish soldier who had gone out to win freedom for others and had returned to find himself regarded with scorn and suspicion as an agent of a Government that had failed to give freedom to his own country. Mr. Redmond had risked his political future by holding

out the hand of friendship to England in 1914. The War Office had thwarted and spurned his offer. In the Convention a substantial measure of agreement had been reached, but to no purpose. Conscription had merely exasperated the country, and weakened rather than strengthened Britain's military effort. The only obstacle to a permanent settlement was the so-called Homogeneous Ulster, which in fact was confined to two counties and a borough and a half. Mr. Abraham's Celtic fire effectually raised the temperature of the House.

Mr. J. P. MILNE (Trinity) said that Ireland's only real difficulty was the religious antagonism. Her crocodile tears were based on imaginary sorrows.

Mr. G. H. SHAKESPEARE (Emmanuel), rising from the cross-benches, denied the responsibility of the Government for a state of affairs that was almost incapable of legislative solution.

Mr. D. M. REID (Emmanuel) : No Irish solution was possible till the Government was relieved from its pre-occupations in the Paris Conference ; to which Mr. G. G. SHARP (Fitzwilliam Hall) retorted that the Premier should have delegated authority to deal with Ireland to some responsible minister at home.

Mr. N. H. HILLSON (Downing) described, with a genuine conviction which will always arrest the House, the despair which had driven Sinn Fein into the hands of Germany. Ireland's war history was a record of generous offers scorned and sincere compromises stultified by England's lack of understanding. To Mr. P. J. HEATON (Queens') the priesthood's interference in politics was the cause of Ireland's distress, while Mr. F. E. SMITH (Sidney) protested that the presence of the British troops was alone responsible. Mr. R. S. HENRY, U.S. (Queens') enlarged on the poisoning of Britain's international relations by the Irish problem. That the Irishmen in America alone outnumbered the Irishmen at home was in itself irrefutable proof that England had failed.

There also spoke in support of the motion : Mr. T. Swan (Emmanuel) and Mr. L. H. Perraton (Christ's), and against : Mr. E. W. Sampson (Corpus).

Division :—Ayes, 94 ; Noes, 58.

MAY 20th, 1919.

Motion : "*That, in the opinion of this House, the wide application of the Whitley Report will afford the best solution of the problem of industrial unrest.*"

On this motion the House had the opportunity of giving its attention to one of the most important attempts at solving the problems of modern industry. How difficult the problems are, was apparent when Mr. Frank Hodges declared that the proposed solution was entirely unacceptable to most of the largest bodies of organised labour. The debate was marked with several speeches of considerable force, showing great diversity of view, but an equal sincerity on both sides in their efforts to solve the problem.

Mr. J. B. CONDLIFFE (Gonville and Caius), in a characteristically well-informed speech, explained how the Whitley Committee had outlined a skeleton of industrial machinery suited to the exigencies of the different trades. The scheme was frankly a compromise between capitalistic production and democratic control of industry, and sought to allay the paralysing suspicion between masters and men. Labour had herein the opportunity of working towards the goal of self-government in industry and of gaining preliminary experience in management. The only alternative was a continuance of the policy of drift towards a series of prolonged and bitter strikes in which the middle classes would be crushed between the contending parties.

Mr. G. G. SHARP (Fitzwilliam Hall), who is also in his element in industrial politics, decried the scheme as out-of-date. Labour difficulties had moved past the time when they could be removed by consultative councils. The organised workers saw in the scheme a probability of extended Government interference, and frankly repudiated the proffered palliative.

Colonel MALONE, M.C. (M.P. for Leyton, East), explained the very considerable success that the Whitley Councils had already achieved. They were the natural result of the greater responsibility and fuller share in life in general that Labour had legitimately demanded and won as a result of the war. The time called for progress on evolutionary lines, and not for drastic upheavals such as had resulted from the adoption of the industrial franchise in Russia. Whitley Councils had already been established for industries employing over two million workers, and were converting

commerce into a social service with an *esprit de corps* of its own. By discussions across the table, employers would get into touch with the best brains of the workers, while labour would gain an invaluable insight into the problems of finance and management. The Whitley Movement provided an opportunity for the fullest examination of the best method of managing each individual industry. Colonel Malone succeeded in demonstrating to the House that the motion dealt with realities and not with mere academic economics.

Mr. FRANK HODGES (Secretary of the Miners' Federation, Ruskin College, Oxford), fresh from his labours on the Coal Commission, predicted the failure of the Whitley Movement. No permanent improvement in the relation of employers and employed was possible on the present basis. An unholy alliance of divergent interests within any trade could only be reached at the expense of the consumer. The Triple Alliance, which always reflected the growing opinion of the less organised unions, had rejected the scheme owing to its unwillingness to admit that the employer, as a mere provider of capital, had any right to a voice in management. Technical managers and other brain workers were, and would be, recognised as genuine contributors to production. The Whitley scheme provided a purely political solution imposed on industry from without, while educated labour was confident in its powers to evolve a solution for industrial problems from within. Mr. Hodges adds to very considerable oratorical powers a penetrating brain, which is bound to make its impression felt on the industrial history of the near future. The House accorded him a great ovation at the conclusion of his speech, and welcomed his additional contribution to a practical solution at the end of the debate.

Mr. J. H. B. NIHILL (ex-President, Emmanuel) accused the Labour movement of short-sightedness in refusing this unique opportunity of utilising the scheme as an introduction to greater changes. In many cases in practice the two extremes had already met and reached substantial agreement on important points. So far from constituting a barrier, the Whitley Report should be a land-mark on the road to industrial development. Mr. Nihill tackled Mr. Hodges with great courage, and considerable success.

In the view of Mr. T. B. HOSTE (Emmanuel) the grave



social evils of the moment could only be cured by bold social experiments, and not by industrial remedies.

Mr. P. N. W. STRONG (Selwyn) based his confidence in the Whitley Report on the success of the Lever experiment and the co-operative movement.

After speeches in support from Mr. A. SCHOFIELD (Gonville and Caius), and in opposition from Mr. J. P. MILNE (Trinity) and Mr. J. A. CARROLL (Sidney), the House expressed its approval of the Whitley Scheme by 126 votes to 88.

MAY 27th, 1919.

Motion: "*That this House would welcome the immediate reform of the Divorce Laws of England and Wales.*"

This motion provided a rather one-sided debate, which was unremarkable except for a vigorous and broad-minded speech from the opener, Mr. S. C. Morgan. The weakness of the opposition necessarily lay in natural disinclination of the House to discuss freely the religious question, without which no effective defence can be raised to Divorce Reform. Notwithstanding the difficulty, the tail wagged vigorously to the end.

Mr. S. COPE MORGAN (Trinity), while appreciating the religious sincerity of the Opposition, hoped to show that laws morally good could never run counter to the highest interpretation of religious faith. The present procedure in divorce was ineffective, and could not be remedied until the Assize Courts throughout the country obtained jurisdiction to hear causes now determined only in London. Equality of the sexes was essential to justice. The present law pressed more heavily on the poor than the rich, so that now they were taking the law into their own hands. No religious purpose was served by binding the innocent party by legal bonds when the spiritual tie had been dissolved. An extension of the grounds for dissolution should be made to comprise wilful desertion, commuted death sentence, incurable insanity, and cruelty, strictly defined, while absolute equality of the sexes could not logically be denied.

Mr. J. W. MORRIS (Vice-President, Trinity Hall), in a liberal interpretation of the motion, was prepared to follow the proposer in advocating certain procedural reforms, including equality of the sexes, but was adamant



against embarking on the perilous seas that surrounded every proposal for widening the grounds for divorce. Infidelity alone could form the basis for a claim for dissolving the tie and giving freedom to remarry; the other tragedies of unsuccessful unions were adequately met by separation orders and decrees of nullity. Separation left open the door to reconciliation. No steps must be countenanced that in any way might imperil the sacred character of the marriage tie. Better the few should suffer than that any disturbing shock should be given to the sanctity and indissolubility of the union on which the homes of the people were based. On the homes of the people the destiny and greatness of our country depended.

Mr. G. H. SHAKESPEARE (Emmanuel), basing his view on the simple ground of expediency, postulated that no laws should be so strict as to lead to their general disregard. To-day immoral unions were countenanced and approved because popular opinion recognised that the law was inadequate. The acute and poignant distress which was caused in many homes throughout the country by the rigours of the divorce laws could not be justified in the name of religion. It was an exaggeration to speak of moral anarchy arising from the recognition by the State of the dissolution of the bond when the spiritual basis of the union had already gone. Every reform in history had been met with the argument of the thin end of the wedge, and it was cowardice not to face the question fairly. The House was asked to remove an intolerable burden from the innocent sufferers so that the nation might be enriched by their entry into a fuller and happier married life.

Mr. A. S. LE MAITRE (St. John's) deplored the opportunism of the proposers. No legal rules could determine at what moment the essential basis of a marriage had disappeared. Reform would lead to national degeneracy. Mr. Le Maitre then entered into a speculation as to the origin of marriage law, became irrelevant and sat down.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Peterhouse) denied that on moral grounds there was anything to choose between divorce and separation. Any attempt to enforce by law particular religious views of marriage was sheer intolerance.

Mr. D. M. REID (Emmanuel) welcomed the strictness of the marriage tie as a check against hasty action which might lead to catastrophe.

Lieut. D. T. C. FIELD (Emmanuel) courageously challenged the assertion that expediency was alone involved. A definite moral issue of right or wrong was raised. The traitor to the marriage bond deserved the penalty of the traitor to the State.

Mr. E. J. MASKELL (Emmanuel) : The law should not attempt to perpetuate the union when personal love was dead.

To Mr. J. P. MILNE (Trinity) it was unreasonable that the voluntary parties to an unsuccessful marriage should call upon the State to relieve them of the results of their mistake.

After speeches in support from Mr. J. F. A. North (Downing), Mr. E. R. C. Walker (Emmanuel) and Mr. F. E. Smith (Sidney Sussex) had been answered by Mr. E. L. Davison (St. John's) the Division showed : Ayes, 145 ; Noes, 38.

JUNE 3rd, 1919.

Motion : "*That, in the opinion of this House, the best interests of the country would be served by a speedy return to the principles of Liberalism.*"

A crowded and excited House assembled in the anticipation of enjoying a verbal duel between Sir John Simon and Mr. Smillie. Unfortunately the former was unavoidably prevented from coming to Cambridge, his place being most adequately filled, however, by the Rev. J. K. Mozley (Pembroke). Mr. Smillie received an ovation such as the House is always willing to accord to a distinguished stranger, and charmed his friends and foes alike by his transparent honesty and power. The result of the poll was first announced by the President.

*President* : Mr. J. W. Morris (Trinity Hall).

*Vice-President* : Mr. G. H. Shakespeare (Emmanuel).

*Secretary* : Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel).

*Standing Committee* : Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke).

Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's).

Mr. J. H. Barnes (St. John's).

Mr. J. B. Condliffe (Gonville and Caius).

Mr. N. G. Dunning (Peterhouse).

Mr. C. P. Best (Sidney Sussex).

The customary votes of thanks having been accorded to the retiring officers, Mr. W. L. McNAIR (retiring President, Gonville and Caius) emphasised the necessity of a return to principles which were apt to become strained during the stress of war. The present Coalition was the product of a war emergency, and was impossible as a lasting system. The time was ripe for the revival of Government by a united party possessing a coherent policy. Unionism was an old man's faith without pride of ancestry or hope of progeny. Labour was too deeply committed to direct action to govern successfully by constitutional methods. Liberalism alone remained as a central policy to which all moderate men could adhere. It stood for freedom in its fullest sense, and was in no way antagonistic to the real aims of Labour.

This evoked from Mr. H. GROSE HODGE (ex-President, Pembroke) a torrential condemnation of the Liberal party, and Mr. Asquith in particular. Before the war the Liberals were wolves in sheeps' clothing; during the war they were sheep in wolves' clothing. In both disguises he disliked them intensely. Where were the principles of Liberalism to be found? Mr. Asquith had throughout his administration violated the orthodox professions of his faith, in particular in the Trades Disputes Act, the policy towards the feminist movement, and the threat to Ulster in 1914. The Liberals had made no provision for the war, which found the country wholly unprepared. Their real principles were to get into office, to remain in office, and to wait and see. Could the Ethiopian change his skin? And yet his skin could not be blacker, nor that of the leopard more indelibly covered with spots, than that of the Liberal party. "Get you gone, get you gone, and give you place to better men."

The Rev. J. K. MOZLEY (ex-President, Pembroke) made a vigorous reply to the accusations laid against his leader. The charge of hypocrisy was easy to make, hard to combat, but had been unsubstantiated. Mr. Asquith had borne for ten years an unexampled burden of responsibility and had deserved well of England. Liberalism, in its principles, showed a temper and a spirit; it was evolutionary and, in the best sense, opportunist. The world, and this country in particular, needed three things which Liberalism could alone give it, a secure and lasting peace

backed by the League of Nations, a restored respect for parliamentary institutions, and a new social order arrived at by evolutionary means.

Mr. ROBERT SMILLIE (President of the Miners' Federation) rising at a late hour, immediately captured the attention of the House. He began by protesting against the scant justice that had been paid to Scotland throughout the debate. Scotland was the home of Liberalism, and, without her, England, which had held the first place in the debate, would have had no Liberalism. Continuing, Mr. Smillie regretted that even here his long search for the principles of Liberalism had been unfruitful. Pledges in plenty had been given in the past only to be forgotten as soon as their object had been served. The workers had again and again returned the Liberal party to power, but had not received the social reforms which they had the right to expect. Slow to learn, Labour had at last realised that it must pursue a course independent of the two historic parties and saw in Liberalism the more formidable antagonist of the two. The Tory party was its declared enemy, and made no hypocritical pretensions to its support. Labour could never come to real grips with the party of capital until the relics of Liberalism had been cleared from its path. Mr. Smillie spoke of the times when there was really a Merrie England, and deplored the commercial system which had driven thousands to emigration and condemned the workers to miserable housing and inefficient education. The knowledge of this caused him to be a rebel, with a determination to arouse the country to a realisation of the position. Why were the children of the working classes compelled to go into mine and factory at a time when his hearers were really commencing their education? Every child born in this country had a right to expect an opportunity of obtaining the highest education. Countless poets, artists, inventors were condemned to sterility by the industrial system which denied them an opportunity to rise. The working classes were realising their power with amazing rapidity, and would not tolerate a continuance of the old system. What system would evolve none could tell. As to Russia, only a few in the inner councils of the Government could as yet judge what measure of success had been attained. The Kaiser and his entourage were only partially to blame for the war. The capitalistic system in England, America, Germany and

elsewhere was the real cause, and, until that was broken, wars would continue.

Labour was confident in its ability to govern the country by constitutional means. If the education of the workers was incomplete, that must lie at the doors of the Conservative and Liberal parties. When they did come to power they would ask for the assistance of all educated men of goodwill. Let there arise again a Merrie England as good as the Merrie England of the past.

On a division there voted for the motion, 115 ; against, 240.

### GENERAL REVIEW.

The May Term, 1919, saw the Union in nearly all respects restored to its ordinary activities. The management of the Society was once more in the hands of elected officers and committee, and the number of new members during the six months ending June, 1919, equalled the average annual entry for the years immediately preceding the war. The fact that over fifty members addressed the chair during the six debates of this exceptionally short term is sufficient proof of the restored vitality of the Society. The policy of rigorously applying the closure to long speeches received ample justification in the sustained interest in debates and in the general high level of speaking. If brevity is the soul of wit, it is certainly the secret of successful debating. Though no attempt will be made in this place to pass in review individually all those who took part in the debates, mention must be made of a few of the more prominent speakers. On motions dealing with industrial politics Mr. J. B. Condliffe (Gonville and Caius) could generally be relied on for a sound constructive speech enlivened with a few droll stories from the Antipodes; Mr. G. G. Sharp (Fitzwilliam Hall) for a sympathetic statement of his case, with an occasional *bon mot*, and Mr. G. L. Jones (Emmanuel) for a stern matter-of-fact advocacy of the Labour point of view. Lieut. D. T. C. Field (Emmanuel), one of the few naval officers who could be induced to speak, and Mr. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke) represented the Imperialist school, and without fail met with the opposition of Mr. I. David (St. John's) and Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse), who combined considerable oratory power with debating skill. Though the usual strict party



lines were somewhat blurred, it was not difficult to know on which side would be found Mr. C. P. Best (Sidney), Mr. E. Herbert (Trinity) and Mr. J. H. Barnes (St. John's), each in his own way a sound debater. One of the best speeches of the term came from Mr. S. Cope Morgan (Trinity) on Divorce Reform. India's aspirations were on occasion voiced with great fluency by Mr. V. K. Thakur (Fitzwilliam Hall), and Mr. S. S. Imam (Trinity), while the divergent parties of South Africa had as their spokesmen Mr. C. N. Thompson (St. John's) and Mr. A. C. Thompson (Trinity Hall).

No record of this time would be complete which did not acknowledge the great debt that the Society owes to the ex-Presidents in residence and other senior members of the University, who, by their presence and support, helped to make the debates as successful as they undoubtedly were.



## Michaelmas Term, 1919.

### OFFICERS.

*President* : J. W. MORRIS (Trinity Hall).

*Vice-President* : G. H. SHAKESPEARE (Emmanuel).

*Secretary* : D. M. REID (Emmanuel).

#### *Standing Committee*

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE (Pembroke).

Mr. A. S. LE MAITRE (St. John's).

Mr. J. H. BARNES (St. John's).

Mr. J. B. CONDLIFFE (Gonville and Caius).

Mr. N. G. DUNNING (Peterhouse).

Mr. C. P. BEST (Sidney Sussex).

---

### FIRST DEBATE, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14th, 1919.

*Motion* : " *That, in the opinion of this House, the tendencies of organised labour are a menace to the present interests of the country.*"

During the past two terms the Union Society had gradually re-started all its activities ; the last debate was the culmination of a successful effort. Since the middle of January, men had trickled back to the University through the steady filter of demobilization, so that, by the end of the May Term, the atmosphere was almost that of a normal pre-war year. By October the University was quite abnormal ; pre-war veterans, Freshmen with a record of five winters' campaigning, Freshmen direct from Schools, combined to cram Cambridge beyond its capacity. Debates at the Union promised to be more "live" than ever before.

In the Long Vacation, Labour troubles were acute. Old men dreamed dreams of England's decaying greatness ; young men saw visions of the energising effect of the growth of a free and unfettered democracy. At the end of September a Railway Strike paralysed the whole life of the country, and a general strike seemed imminent. It was just after these big events that term began, and the motion selected for the first Union debate proved opportune. The House was packed ; competition to speak was keen.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE (Pembroke) proposed the motion. He began by pointing out that the outlook of the mass of labour was a narrow one. Even so he had no quarrel with their aims, but condemned their means. The root of many of the present-day evils lay in the Trades Disputes Act of 1906. The Railway Strike had been purely political ; an absolute negation of democracy. He followed with a strong indictment of labour agitators who were producing Bolshevism in England. Men no longer obeyed their leaders ; the country's trade was in a perilous state ; labour was not working its best. The speaker concluded with his picture of the results of present tendencies, and left the house with an awful nightmare of national bankruptcy, increased taxation, lack of education, and ultimate anarchy.

The House, which was a full one, listened intently to the speeches, for many were present who were forming first impressions of a Union Debate. The audience at the Union is seldom very responsive ; it is not an audience that is easily roused, nor one that is easy to address ; perhaps it resembles the House of Commons !

Mr. G. G. SHARP (Fitzwilliam Hall) opposed. He led us from the Chamber of Horrible Possibilities of the last speaker to the Chamber of Horrible Realities. One-third of the country's wealth was in the hands of one-thirtieth of its population ; individual comfort had suffered at the hands of a cruel capitalist system. The British Empire was not worth having at a low standard of individual comfort. "The present alternatives are national bankruptcy or nationalisation." We must have a democratised industry.

The debate seemed to be developing into a discussion on Labour policy, but Mr. G. G. COULTON (Fellow of St. John's College), speaking third, reminded the House that the debate was on present tendencies. Consider the recent strike. "Labour to-day has become conscious of its strength, but not of the complexity of life." Mr. Cramp had declared himself ready for revolution ; Mr. J. H. Thomas had stated that we were never nearer civil war than we were a fortnight ago. The recent strike was brought about by the revolutionary element, and not by the rank and file ; the latter were wrong in blindly following their leaders ; the country had been brought to the verge of civil war. Labour forms a vast mass of the

electorate ; let Parliament be considered the true adjuster of grievances. This speech—with no needless phrases or empty oratory—presented a scathing indictment. Reason, justice, and fair play—these are qualities that might well be possessed by a brilliant historian who in his time was a rowing “blue.”

Mr. G. D. H. COLE, who spoke fourth, is one of the most advanced, or, as some think, extreme amongst the young intellectuals of the Labour movement. He is a forcible and fluent speaker, dealing with his subject in an entirely serious manner, and giving the impression of being one who deplores humbug, and would not suffer fools gladly. Which side had been the better prepared for the railway strike ? The Government had admitted their preparations. The strike was forced by certain influences working on the Government. There was a campaign on foot to lower wages. The repeated promises of a new Heaven and new Earth had brought no result. Parliament was scorned ; it was composed of fifth-rate company promoters. Competition had vanished in this country ; large interests were in the hands of a few. The constructive remedy for present ills was a change of system ; there must be democracy in industry. A great change of principle could not take place without some unconstitutional element.

There also spoke : *For*—Mr. C. P. Best (Sidney), Mr. P. N. W. Strong (Selwyn), Mr. S. C. Morgan (Trinity), Rev. F. A. Gage-Hall (Trinity), Mr. H. M. Yeatman (Pembroke), Mr. A. L. Sells (Sidney), Mr. E. S. Arundel (Corpus).

*Against*—Mr. J. F. A. North (Downing), Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's), Mr. F. E. Lawley (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. E. L. Davison (St. John's), Mr. J. Herman (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. A. W. Russell (Caius), Mr. K. Smellie (St. John's), Mr. M. I. Rahim (Pembroke).

*Division*—Ayes, 242 ; Noes, 190.

Majority for : 52. House adjourned 11.46 p.m.

Their Royal Highnesses Prince Albert and Prince Henry were present, so taking their first possible opportunity of attending a Union Debate. They took seats on the cross-benches. Prior to the debate they joined the Society as ordinary members, the President having the honour of nominating them.

SECOND DEBATE, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21ST, 1919.

Motion: "*That this House considers the League of Nations to be worthless as a guarantee of international peace, and to be a radically unsound and dangerous project.*"

This was a soul-inspiring evening; one that will figure as a landmark in the memories of those whose good fortune it was to be present, as the days of the great battles will to those who served in the war. Probably it is no conceit to say that the debate was the finest that has ever taken place in the Union. From every point of view the occasion was noteworthy and unique. It was the first Visitors' Debate of a term which passed all bounds in its record number of resident undergraduates. The two visitors were great personalities—The Duke of Northumberland and Lord Robert Cecil. The subject for debate was not merely topical, it was momentous; it was a discussion of a great ideal which has become a religion to so many; an ideal for which a fervent and ardent passion of enthusiasm is felt. The audience was composed of those who really and intensely understood the meaning of the phrase "the horrors of war." That was the setting of what proved not a mere dialectical duel, but a searching enquiry in which every word was produced by a depth of conviction and a wealth of experience, and which culminated in a speech from Lord Robert Cecil that was conceived in idealism, and delivered in a manner exhibiting that real fire of eloquence which stirs to the depths the very fibre of one's being.

Those who know the accommodation of the debating hall will understand all that is implied when it is said that over 1,000 members voted. To others, it is hardly possible to describe the scene. A sea of men—which surged over every possible space on the floor of the house, under the Secretary's table, and all round and almost on top of the President's chair. Conditions were reminiscent of a Crystal Palace Cup-Tie. In fact, as Lord Robert said afterwards, "The meeting of the Union at Cambridge was one of the most remarkable I have ever attended. It was crowded to an extent which would have been quite impossible if the audience had not consisted mainly of young and vigorous men."

It was only with great difficulty that the officers and speakers were able to reach their places. H.R.H. Prince

Albert and H.R.H. Prince Henry were present ; they entered the Hall just before what is known as "the procession," and met with a rousing cheer.

The division barriers were all carried away and broken as if mere wooden bridges on a swollen and rushing torrent.

The speeches provided a dialectical feast, and one in which the best wine had been left until the last. The speech of Mr. Morgan was an admirable one for the occasion. His rôle was to present sufficient argument to be the foundation-stone of the debate. This he did ; but, furthermore, he delighted the House by a sparkling exhibition from his store and factory of humour. His speech was more of a firework display than a smashing bombardment, and it has since been rumoured (and we think it is true) that the speaker was indulging in a practising canter in the art of "stating a case." Mr. Butler adopted sledge-hammer tactics. Point by point, opposing arguments were taken up and dealt with. If the debate were to be decided by sheer logic, reasoning, and wealth of matter, there could have been little room for doubt as to the result of the division.

The Duke of Northumberland spoke with great fluency and clarity. The sincerity of his views could not be doubted.

An incident worth recording occurred in the reception room before the speakers entered the Debating Hall. As is customary, the two visitors were asked to sign their names in the Visitors' Book. The Duke was asked to do so first, and readily agreed ; the book was lying open on the table. Through the cunning humour of the Chief Clerk, the last signature in the book was that of Mr. Robert Smillie. His Grace sat down at the table and picked up a pen. His eye then caught the signature of Mr. Smillie, and he paused. A sly smile passed over the faces in the room, but the Duke dashed off his signature without comment.

The Duke's argument was as follows : A nation's first duty is defence. Politicians invariably try to burk their responsibilities in this matter, and disaster results. The League of Nations is yet another of these politicians' devices. Let us beware. Let us arm and form strong alliances.

Lord Robert Cecil pounced on this argument, and dealt with it in the manner of a wolf towards a lamb. As



a consequence the House heard not a mere speech, but a passionate, electrical, stirring appeal. Sentence by sentence the noble lord carried the House with him. Members were spellbound as by a wizardry of sheer eloquence, made the more inspiring by the tremor or break in the voice which is characteristic of Lord Robert. Some will still have the picture of the tall figure leaning over the despatch box, dealing with the argument about alliances. With an affable smile to the Duke he said, "I am sure the noble lord will not misunderstand me when I say that that is a *mad* policy." Or, again, when he said, "To describe membership of the League of Nations as slavery is surely to stretch hyperbole beyond all sense." His final appeal was rousing. Youth is to decide the issue. "Let Youth decide. Are we to drift back to the old reign of force? Are we to risk not only the material destruction of Europe—for that is what a new war would mean—but the hopeless moral degradation of never trying to put an end to this horrible thing? Or shall we not rather put this country at the head and let England show a way along the path of improvement and progress for mankind?"

A more detailed but by no means complete account of the speeches must be attempted.

Mr. S. COPE MORGAN (Trinity), in proposing, compared his remarks to the chirruping of a sparrow. He defined war as a "nasty, uncomfortable, and even dangerous pursuit." The League of Nations was a mere quack remedy: it lulled our beliefs with dangerous promises which it was unable to fulfil. Every question—when under the League—would be whittled down to one of compromise, and certain questions required a plain "yea" or "nay," and could not be settled with a mere "M—yes."

The Peace terms did not spring from a real and live faith in the potentialities of the League. How about the frontier between Italy and the Tyrol? And had not the remodelling of the map of Europe proceeded entirely on strategical lines? There is no effective police force in the League; moral suasion is not enough. We are up against human nature, which is still full of the old Adam. "To put our trust in the League of Nations would be to bury our heads in the sand and bring upon us a mountain of disaster in the not distant future."

Some of Mr. Morgan's phrases were interesting: "the



pious platitudes of President Wilson"; "the swollen head of a discredited politician and pseudo-loyal leader" (with reference to an Irish leader). " 'God's in His Heaven, all's right with the world'—while I have the sincerest belief in the truth of the first proposition, I have the profoundest misgiving of the second." "When old men dither and young men go upon the Stock Exchange."

Mr. J. R. M. Butler (ex-President, Trinity) denied that the League of Nations was responsible for the distressing state of Europe. That present conditions were serious was not denied; the Shantung and Tyrol settlements were both in disaccord with principle. But the argument from all this was not that we should have no league, but that we should have a stronger league.

It was a great advance to arrange for regular and periodical meetings of statesmen.

Machinery was set up for the revision of treaties, for the reduction of armaments, for the mandatory system for an International Secretariat, and for the settlement of disputes before war. "The world cannot be re-created by mere machinery; what the League will really live by is its spirit." That spirit is to be found among the common people of the world. Success will only come by taking the long view—"a great empire and little minds go ill together." "You cannot settle the problems of the 20th century by the principles of the 16th century."

The proposer had used an argument about the immutability of human nature, with which the opposer dealt. In the course of this a brilliant repartee is to be recorded.

The Opposer. "The Proposer says that human nature will never change."

The Proposer (rising). "On the contrary, I said it would change in the millennium."

The Opposer. "But I have never heard that the truths of mathematics are imperilled because straight lines meet at infinity."

The alternatives to the League were either Bolshevism, the world revolution of the proletariat, or the Balance of Power which produced those conflicts which upset the fruits of centuries of peace. The latter was armed peace, a moral and physical death; against these tendencies the League would be a living and saving force.

The Duke of Northumberland said that the choice at the present day was between remaining an armed

savage and becoming a slave, and he preferred the former. The Covenant of the League was an ingenious document ; it might be a fine building, but was it founded on sand or on a rock ? The League had no ethical, moral, or religious basis, while on the other hand the theory of the Balance of Power was only common sense. The League erected an atmosphere of camouflage ; the balance of power recognised a danger and prepared. The League was only another form of "Organised Hypocrisy." It was an excuse for the Socialist who saw in it the germs of an international State, and for the pacifist—who loved it because it seemed the destruction of militarism ; an excuse for the easy-going politicians to shirk their duties, and for the visionaries who saw in it the realisation of their idle dreams.

There was beginning a great re-action from democracy and mob-rule to autocracy. In preparation for this we must form alliances ; would it not be better to found the settlement of Europe on strategical considerations ? "The League is the best means ever devised for obscuring the necessity for preparing for war." It was an excuse for avoiding the burden of national defence. We had to steer between the Scylla of Germanism and the Charybdis of Bolshevism ; if we were dragged into the whirlpool the League would be at fault.

Lord ROBERT CECIL received a magnificent ovation on rising. He complimented the Duke on "his brilliant presentation of a bad case." The Duke had been against the League, because it set up a new system ; but then he would be against any new system, whatever it was.

Time and again in history the common sense of the common people had been right. The present international system was intolerable ; almost any other system would be preferable to it.

We had had alliances in the past ; surely that was one very good reason why we should not have them again. The policy outlined by the Duke was one of big armies and navies ; a policy indistinguishable from that of Germany. History was thick with the fragments of broken alliances ; let us not drift back to that discredited scheme.

There was no other alternative but the League ; it was based on the principle that mankind hated war ; the tendency to co-operate was stronger than the tendency to fight. Why should we not be able to find a remedy for this horrible thing—war ? The League was not the

millennium, it was not perfect, but it was based on a recognition of the fact that the present system was wrong. Then followed the peroration given above.

The effect of this speech was apparent in the division which followed. This was taken under difficulties. The President had to appeal to the forbearance of members to ensure a representative vote. The House being so crowded the Division took about 15 minutes. The result was announced shortly before midnight, when the House rose.

Figures : For, 280 ; Against, 723. Majority Against, 443.

### THIRD DEBATE, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28th, 1919.

Motion : “ *That this House would welcome the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic liquors in this country.* ”

A debate in which members alone took part proved rather refreshing after the full-dress night of the previous week. The motion presented a clear issue and embodied a bold proposition. It was considered best to discuss prohibition itself rather than any boiled down and diluted scheme which strives to attain the same end. Furthermore, “Pussyfootism” was at the time rather in the limelight of popular discussion.

The division was commented on by certain advocates of a “dry England” as being remarkable, for it was pointed out that nearly half those present voted in favour of even such a root-and-branch measure as that indicated in the terms of the motion.

Mr. J. H. BARNES (St. John's) proposed. He presented a very earnest and straightforward case, basing his argument on the good that would result from an eradication of the obvious evils of drunkenness. From the point of view of sheer industrial efficiency the motion was commendable ; why should we lag behind France, Russia and America ? The somewhat inadequate argument that loss of revenue would ensue was easily set off by the increase in output ensured.

The moderate drinker, with his raving about “personal liberty,” was the greatest obstacle to reform. With such a principle in issue he would erase the word “liberty” from the dictionary and substitute the word “duty.” Finally—an appeal to free England from the lust and degradation

of drink ; "hurling out this hideous evil, so should we erase one dark spot from England's glorious shield."

Mr. A. S. LE MAITRE said it was useless to try to make people moral by Act of Parliament. The people should be educated to self-respect, and drink would not be abused. The best policy was to improve the public-houses, and better the surroundings of the people. For the hard-worked undergraduate "a beakerfull of the warm South" was at times essential.

Mr. T. R. GLOVER (St. John's, the Senior Proctor), who spoke third, was entirely delightful. He was pleased to renew his youth of 25 years ago and take part in a debate ; he found the House—and its arguments—much the same. It was always the difficulty of a new speaker to frame and utter a first sentence ; he would obviate it, by not having one. He felt rather like a Rip Van Winkle, but the comparison failed, for he had not been asleep ; rather had the opposer so been, for the world of enlightened thought had rolled on and left him behind.

Prohibition in America was an accomplished thing ; it was the outcome of twenty-five years' struggle. The Americans and Canadians were new, progressive peoples ; they were not afraid of new ideas. What was the result ? Empty gaols and workhouses, and people taking to ice-cream ; that did not make them drunk. In Seattle the people banished drink and went in for matrimony, Ford cars, ice-cream, and work on Mondays.

"What is morally right is economically sound." As to freedom—was England really free to-day ? Was England free when one could not get a hair-cut on a Thursday afternoon ? or buy butter without a ticket ? or smoke in cap and gown ? There must be restriction of the individual for the good of the community ; though it is impossible to make people good by Act of Parliament, the causes of harm can be removed.

Mr. J. T. SHEPPARD (King's, ex-President), speaking fourth, was at his best, and those who know the Union know what that means. He is always so stimulating, because his argument sounds the true note of originality. The whole question, he said, involved the differentiation between man and brute. It was man's privilege to choose between right and wrong ; in this lay terrific dangers, but all the things that really mattered to men were attended by dangers. To be able to abuse the good things of life

and not to do so—this was to find one's manhood. Prohibition would remove what helped so many to bear lives not all sunshine. As to the choice between "England Free" and "England Sober"—"I would have England free *and*—in moderation—sober."

The main argument of the last speaker seemed to have been that there were precedents for all forms of tyranny, and why should we not add another?

It was impertinent for three men to lay down that a fourth should not have the choice of a thing productive of both good and evil results. Our whole attitude to life was involved; our aim should be to build up a country capable of using the finer things of life in the proper way.

There also spoke: *For*—Mr. D. M. Reid (Secretary), Rev. W. H. Norman (Caius), Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel), Mr. J. B. Condliffe (Caius), Mr. T. Swan (Emmanuel), Mr. T. S. Pedler (Queens'), Mr. J. Herman (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. M. L. Berlyn (Trinity Hall), Mr. C. B. Tracey (St. John's), Mr. C. P. Prest (St. John's).

*Against*—Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse), Mr. A. L. Sells (Sidney), Mr. E. R. C. Walker (Emmanuel), Mr. V. W. W. S. Purcell (Trinity), Mr. B. J. B. Ezard (Trinity Hall), Mr. D. T. C. Field (Emmanuel), Mr. H. M. Heckstall-Smith (Sidney), Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's).

Division: —Ayes, 182; Noes, 205. Majority Against, 23. House adjourned 11.50 p.m.

#### FOURTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4th, 1919.

Motion: "*That this House would welcome an immediate return to the system of Party Government.*"

The debate did not prove as successful as previous ones in the term had been, though it produced twenty-two speeches, including a few "maidens." Perhaps the issue was not sufficiently clearly defined. The motion met with the following criticism, "What else have we got at present but Party Government?" A suggestion was made that members would say they belonged to the "No-Party Party." However, the debate was fought on two issues: (1) is there any alternative to the party system of Government? (2) has the present Coalition outlived its usefulness?



Mr. N. G. DUNNING (Peterhouse), in proposing, confessed his dislike of the Government, who had obtained office under very suspicious circumstances. Mr. Lloyd George was a man sent from God for a time of great national emergency ; he had now fallen into bad company. The present Government was a strange administration of political opportunists. In a Coalition there were two wills, two organisations and two purposes. How many reforms had been accomplished since the Election ? There was no real opposition in the present House of Commons, which body was not even respected. The speaker concluded with a plea for the Labour Party, to enable whose return he urged the renewal of Party Government.

Mr. C. P. BEST (Sidney) opposed. Party Government was like a house divided against itself ; it gave us weak government. Liberalism had in the past given birth to a viper which was concealed in the Coalition cradle during the war. The party system nullified democracy ; the people simply became penned in two or three compartments. The closure, unconsidered legislation and the like—these were its fruits. A party government simply pampered ; it placed its own popularity before everything. Under the pampering the people became bilious, and now the Coalition had the thankless task of administering the medicine. The real dominant instinct in man was co-operation for good. If we became divided at this time, our country must go down at breakneck speed into the valley of destruction.

Mr. P. N. W. STRONG (Selwyn), who spoke third, began his speech in a startling manner. The hon. opposer's speech, he said, had left him cold ; in fact he felt as if he had just left a hot and clammy greenhouse. It was essential to efficiency to have change ; without it, there was weariness, slackness, and morbidness. A democracy can only be ruled on party lines. The only choice was, first, an autocracy ; second, a Coalition ; or thirdly, a Soviet. The doom of the first was sealed when tottering thrones had fallen like ninepins ; a coalition tried to please all and succeeded in pleasing none ; the condemnation of the Soviet was written by the bleeding heart of Russia. Therefore, let us return to our party system. Do not accept unity at the expense of efficiency. Mr. Strong gave us good measure in alliteration and metaphor, though at times he was a little strained.



Mr. D. T. C. FIELD (Emmanuel) showed himself a cunning debater by reminding the House that opposition to the motion did not necessarily involve support of the Coalition. Much was lost by confining a man to one party; it was often the case that only one item of a Party programme was believed in, and yet the whole would have to be voted for. Under the Party system, a debate in the House of Commons was a mere farce. The Opposition could only defeat the Government by a "snap division"—organised buffoonery. Politicians put their party before their country. Each political issue ought to be judged on its merits, but under the party system this was impossible.

There also spoke *For*—Mr. S. C. Morgan (Trinity), Mr. G. G. Sharp (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall), Mr. P. J. Griffiths (Peterhouse), Mr. E. E. Edwards (Downing), Mr. R. W. Perry (Peterhouse), Mr. W. D. Johnston (Christ's), Mr. E. W. Sampson (Corpus), Mr. D. Morris (Christ's), Mr. T. S. Pedler (Queens').

*Against*—Mr. G. H. Shakespeare (Emmanuel, Vice-President), Lord Louis Mountbatten (Christ's), Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke), Mr. G. G. Phillips (Trinity), Mr. D. D. Warren (Corpus), Mr. H. V. Barran (Trinity), Mr. J. Herman (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's).

Division :—Ayes, 137 ; Noes, 155. Majority Against, 18.

#### FIFTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11th, 1919.

Motion : " *That this House would welcome a levy on capital.*"

It was with some misgiving that the above motion was set down. Though the question of our national indebtedness and finance is not one that is shirked by our demobilised Demosthenes and embryo-politician, it yet remains one that presents difficulties for an academic discussion—especially on a cold November night with blazing bonfires outside flashing out the call to join in Armistice anniversary celebrations. However, the experiment was a success. In spite of a most illuminating exposition by a young and rising Labour member, the cause of a levy was lost.

Mr. J. B. CONDLIFFE (Caius) proposed. In welcoming his supporter—Mr. W. Graham—he remarked on the well-

known financial abilities of Scotsmen. (The Kaffirs called a florin a "Scotsman," because Scotsmen invariably tried to palm them off as half-crowns!) Our present financial position was undoubtedly very serious; expenditure was in excess of revenue. Expenditure, and not a levy on capital, was the more likely to cut down the tree of national prosperity. The great advantage of a levy was that not only debt, but also interest, was wiped off; in this way income tax—working so hardly on the middle classes—could be reduced. A levy on capital would really be one on property, or on wealth, and would be paid by the people with wealth. It could probably be arranged so as to be paid out of income. Harsh cases there would be, but could that be avoided under any system? Inducements to save would not be removed, for the scheme was not to be a recurring one. The choice—one of pure economic expediency—lay between an immediate sacrifice and years of crushing taxation. Let us lose the tooth by extraction rather than suffer long-drawn-out agony.

The opposer, Mr. E. H. F. MORRIS (Christ's), said he first wished to dispel the dialectical fog created by the proposer. The argument that the levy could be paid out of income was a specious one; but among the class of small manufacturers, one year's income was probably capitalised the next. It was impossible to draw this line between income and capital. The levy was a short-sighted policy that glittered in the eyes of the working classes. It was a dangerous precedent; as we could not bind subsequent parliaments we could not be certain that the experiment would not be repeated—as had happened with income tax. It involved suspicion, and a feeling of financial insecurity, which were fatal to industry. To take away capital was to make Labour less efficient. Our present remedy was increased production; premium bonds, and an Empire contribution were worth consideration.

Mr. W. GRAHAM, M.P. for Central Edinburgh, speaking third, complained of the Government's error during the war in making extravagant financial offers. However, the Socialists did not advocate a repudiation of the National Debt. The material and knowledge on which to base a levy could be easily obtained. As to the feeling of insecurity that it was thought might be engendered, this would largely be set off by the length of notice that would be given, as also by the period over which payment might

be made. It was not proposed to touch the capital of individuals possessing less than £5,000; for these there would be merely a graduated income tax. Of the fortunes made by trusts, and combines, there was a vast amount that could rightly be taken.

The country could best recover from the shock of a capital levy now while Europe was in so dire a strait; other countries were approaching the question. The proposal did not involve "a national pawnshop" in Whitehall; it was not a crazy idea of Labour politicians, but in every way a thoroughly "respectable proposition." "We may be Scotsmen, but we ought to pay our debts quickly."

When an opportunity presented itself to pay off a debt it was only wise and statesmanlike to do so, and therefore we should now be willing to make the sacrifice. Mr. Graham was clear, concise, and convincing.

Mr. W. H. RAMSBOTTOM (Emmanuel, ex-President) followed. Capital was that part of wealth that could produce more wealth. It had been claimed for a levy that it would obviate the necessity of paying interest on our debt; how would this be so if collection of the levy were to be spread over a number of years? The levy would put the rate of exchange against us, would take money from industry and hinder production, would make the government a huge stockholder, and introduce the undesirable alien financier. Human capital was disregarded, and with unrealisable capital the difficulties were insuperable.

Our serious debt was that owed abroad. This would only be wiped off by increased production.

To levy on War Bonds would be a breach of faith; our best and fairest tax was that on income with excess duties on war profits.

Dr. G. P. BIDDER (Trinity) urged payment now when it could be done in "Bradbury's" rather than fifty years hence, when it would have to be in gold.

There also spoke:—*For*—Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity), Hall), Mr. F. W. Paish (Trinity), Mr. F. E. Lawley (Fitzwilliam Hall).

*Against*—Mr. H. V. F. Barran (Trinity), Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel), Mr. D. T. C. Field (Emmanuel), Mr. J. E. Allen (Wadham, Oxford).

Division:—*For*, 123; *Against*, 135. Majority Against,

SIXTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18th, 1919.

Motion : "*That this House would deplore any serious reduction in the expenditure of this country on armaments in the near future.*"

Demosthenes having been engaged in the war, his views on armaments were worth attention. Of yore he was told, "Prepare for war and so—ensure peace." His own ideas proved different : "Prepare for war, and it is sure to come." Armaments are the toys of imperialistic nations ; no matter how dangerous they are, they will certainly be used.

The debate proved one of the best in the term. Perhaps it ought to be said that the subject was suggested by Lord Louis Mountbatten, R.N., who made his first appearance on the paper. The attendance was large, and all the speeches were interesting. H.R.H. Prince Albert and H.R.H. Prince Henry were present, and occupied seats on the cross-benches.

Mr. D. M. REID (Emmanuel, Secretary) proposed. He claimed that support of his motion was not incompatible with a belief in the League of Nations, but the possibility of trouble in the near future had to be faced. "We must keep up our defences until the great day when there will be no more armies." By reducing armaments now we would jeopardise the future of the League.

Alluding to the past few years, he said that there was one idea deep-rooted and set in the minds of all—"whatever happens we will not have any more of that war." By keeping strong we would ward it off until the League was securely established.

Were we to keep faith with the peoples of our Empire, or were we to run risks for the sake of our own pockets ? We were not in so parlous a condition that reduction was necessary. As "business men" we must face this proposition. We must show ourselves to be the great power behind the League.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Peterhouse), in opposing, said that if preparation for war was a security against it, then the world of August, 1914, should have been the most thoroughly peaceful world that ever existed. Our proposed peace army was twice the size of our pre-war army ; our Navy was still large, though—the German Navy having gone—the need for it no longer existed.

We would not effect any real economy merely by

dismissing a few "dug-outs" and "flappers" from Whitehall; if expense was not curtailed the progress of our country would be that of "the Gadarene swine"; the Treasury bench still seemed to be infected with the microbe of "wait and see."

Armaments must depend on policy. Yet look at our Russian complications, and the promiscuous land-grabbing in the East. We paid official lip-service to the League of Nations and conducted our policy as if our signature had never been appended. Reduction was the acid test of our sincerity in the League. "If we allow the League to fail, and return to the policy of piling up armaments, the blame will be on us and the penalty on our children. Are we, by our own carelessness and inertia, to lose this opportunity which is now given to us and which may never return—the opportunity which our dead won and which was consecrated by their blood?"

Sub-Lieut. Lord Louis MOUNTBATTEN, R.N. (Christ's), replying to the arguments of the last speaker, said that had we not been in some way prepared for war in 1914, we would probably not be present to discuss the motion at all. As to expense, its increase was not disproportionate to the rise in prices; the cost of material had risen, and so had wages, especially on the lower deck; was that disapproved? Again, if we were to have more merchant ships we must have protection for them.

He admired Lord Fisher and his policy, but only one person existed who could carry out that policy—Lord Fisher. Lord Fisher once told the Chancellor of the Exchequer that if he took over the Exchequer he could reduce the income tax to 2½d. in the £. As Lord Fisher had not taken on the job, it could not be done.

It had been said that there was no use for foreign policy backed up by the mailed fist. To such an argument he would not reply with flowery language, but with one word—"tripe." [This somewhat expressive colloquialism can hardly be called "parliamentary" language; its effect when used—probably because so unusual and unexpected—was electric, and the House rocked with laughter. The President did not call the noble lord to order, however; to have done so under the circumstances would have been in the nature of an anti-climax.]

Foreign policy without a backing force was mere lunacy; to adopt such would be to make us not a leading



power, but a leading jester of the world. At present we were paying premiums into a very old Insurance Society. Until the rival society was established we must continue to do so. When once the League of Nations was secure, we should turn our fleet—lock, stock and barrel—to work with it.

Mr. G. W. THEOBALD (Emmanuel) took an unexpected line of argument. Advocating an effective Navy, and condemning the League of Nations, the speaker's opposition was based on a desire for the reduction of wasteful expenditure. He said he loved the good old British Navy, but he hated the Admiralty. For over a year he had been trying to get some money they owed him. The Navy ought not, however, to cost as much as it did at present. Against whom were we maintaining it? There were only three adequate fleets in existence—ours, the American and the Japanese. Between the latter two there was a balance of power—a greater safeguard than the intolerable system of a League of Nations.

He had just returned from a place on the outskirts of the Empire where every Englishman was an ardent Imperialist, and he was surprised at the present Labour and Socialist tendencies in England. "A Labour Government and an Empire are two incompatible things." To prevent the swing of the pendulum over to Labour we must have a reduction in expenditure.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE (Pembroke) said that the League of Nations was a "possibility, but not a probability." Any reduction of our support to the colonies would start "the rift in the lute of Empire."

Mr. J. H. RICHARDSON (Emmanuel) urged that reduction was possible, at least in the *near* future.

There also spoke : *For*—Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's), Mr. D. T. C. Field (Emmanuel), Sub-Lieut. R. H. Donnell (Trinity), Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's), Mr. H. M. Yeatman (Pembroke), Mr. D. H. Steers (St. John's), Mr. R. E. Watson (St. Catharine's).

*Against*—Mr. W. W. Pryke (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. E. L. Davison (St. John's), Mr. D. L. Thornton (Magdalene), Mr. J. Herman (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. W. L. Runciman (Trinity), Mr. H. L. Wilson (Emmanuel), Mr. F. E. Lawley (Fitzwilliam Hall).

Division :—*For*, 178 ; *Against*, 214. Majority *Against*, 36.



SEVENTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25th, 1919.

Motion : " *That this House welcomes the policy of Non-Intervention in Russia.*"

The live and burning questions, the topical subjects, invariably provide the best material for good speeches and useful debates. Bolshevism on this occasion acted as excellent eloquence—fodder, and Lenin as a suitable butt for witticisms and declamation. Twenty-four speeches were delivered, and even as midnight approached there must have been quite fifteen who had failed to catch the President's eye.

Mr. G. H. SHAKESPEARE (Emmanuel, Vice-President) proposed. Bolshevism was, he said, the greatest menace of modern times ; he would rather lose his motion than have the support of a single Bolshevik. Trotsky was originally a cinematograph actor ; perhaps he saw a glorious chance of acting a film. Some supporters of Bolshevism were pure idealists, others were pure scoundrels.

What were the suggested grounds of intervention ? There were two main reasons—the German menace and considerations of humanity. As to the first, the only consequence of our interference would be to drive Russia straight into the arms of Germany. We had set up certain independent buffer states on the Baltic coast ; how, then, could we support Kolchak, Deniken, and Yudenitch, who all stood for a united Russia ?

If we intervened on the grounds of humanity, where were we going to stop ? Were we to be the knight-errant of the world and ride about like a Don Quixote ? Must we intervene wherever there was suffering ? Should America interfere in Ireland ?

What Russia wanted was not intervention, but peace. If we launched a campaign in Russia to exterminate Bolshevism, was there not the risk of raising it in our own country ? The only nation that could solve the Russian problem was Russia herself.

Mr. A. C. THOMPSON (Trinity Hall), in opposing, said that before the war the walls of Tzarism barred Germany's road eastwards ; those walls had now crumbled away. The Prussian spirit and Bolshevism might go hand-in-hand and be a menace to our Eastern Empire. A Bolshevik feeler was already spreading and threatening to sap the vitality of the democracies of the world. Recent revolutionary strikes were nothing less than Bolshevism.

He was opposed to recognition of Bolshevism. We should intervene to clear the world of a scourge. The only alternative to intervention was "to shake hands with murder."

Mr. A. HENDERSON (Trinity Hall) confessed himself an opponent of Bolshevism ; as a political creed it was the negation of democracy and inconsistent with the spirit of liberty and freedom. Its horrors and atrocities were not denied, but did the Whites never commit atrocities ? Before the war did we lift a finger to assist those afflicted by the tyranny of Tzardom ?

The Soviet Government had effected a large number of sound measures of social reform.

We had already spent about 100 million pounds on intervention, and yet our Government left thousands destitute by stopping the unemployment dole.

Intervention could not be justified on grounds of expediency, principle, or national advantage. The salvation of Russia lay with the Russian masses ; our policy should be to bring the contending and disruptive elements together.

Mr. A. V. BURBURY (King's), speaking fourth, had the advantage over other speakers of personal experience, having during the latter part of the war been imprisoned in Russia. He considered it was England's duty to help Russia ; it would be dangerous not to do so. Let us show human sympathy with the affairs of Russia, and avoid taking our politics in the tabloid form of catch phrases.

It was impossible to trust the Russian "moujik" until we understood him. The Russians had just evolved from feudal repression ; they possessed the perfectly useless idealism of children and young men educated with faulty chunks of knowledge !

We should assist Russia to eradicate the bad element in Bolshevism, and in doing this we should render her real help in this time of tribulation.

There also spoke : *For*—Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse), Mr. E. A. B. Pritchard (King's), Mr. R. K. Wilson (Trinity Hall), Mr. F. W. Paish (Trinity), Mr. P. J. Griffiths (Peterhouse), Mr. V. S. Ram (Emmanuel), Mr. Abdul Aziz (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. M. H. Dobb (Pembroke), Mr. C. G. Funnell (Sidney), Mr. P. N. W. Strong (Selwyn), Mr. R. Northam (Queens').

*Against*—Mr. C. P. Best (Sidney), Mr. I. M. Horobin (Sidney), Sub-Lieut. Lord Louis Mountbatten (Christ's), Mr. L. E. Room (Corpus), Mr. T. A. Bold (Corpus), Mr. H. V. A. Raikes (Trinity), Mr. I. Macpherson (Trinity), Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's), Mr. R. E. Watson (St. Catharine's).

Division :—Ayes, 218 ; Noes, 132. Majority For, 86.

#### CHANGE OF OFFICERS' DEBATE, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2nd, 1919.

At a Change of Officers' Debate the retiring President first takes the chair as usual, and the result of the poll is read out by him. This invariably provides mild excitement, the various names being greeted with cheers. On this occasion the election for the Secretaryship was conducted on the system of a single transferable vote, for which a progressive Union democracy had legislated during the term.

The poll was announced as follows :—

*President* : Mr. G. H. Shakespeare (Emmanuel), elected unopposed.

*Vice-President* : Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel), elected unopposed.

*Secretary* : Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse).

*Committee* : Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke).

Mr. J. H. Barnes (St. John's).

Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's).

Sub-Lieut. Lord Louis Mountbatten (Christ's).

Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel).

Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall).

After the results have been read through twice (the second being the official declaration of election), the President calls on the newly-elected officers to take their seats. The President himself takes his successor by the right hand and installs him in his chair, after which he descends to his place on the floor of the House.

The newly-elected Secretary then proceeds to move a vote of thanks to the retiring officers, and indulges in as much mild scandal as he can discover or invent.

In performing this office, Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM, the new Secretary, said that retiring presidents had always been described as "impartial and just," vice-presidents as

“energetic and capable,” secretaries as “hard-working and indefatigable.” He considered that the ex-president was endowed with the seven deadly virtues.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE, in seconding, made a little reference to some “seat above the clock,” and warmly eulogised the Chief Clerk, Mr. Stanley Brown.

Mr. J. W. MORRIS (Trinity Hall, retiring President), replied. He considered it a most trying ordeal after enjoying a power more autocratic than a Lenin for a whole year. The proposer and seconder had relied on their memory for their humour and their imagination for their facts. He thanked the Society for the honour they had done him. There were two classes of men—those who were found out, and those who were not ; he was a fortunate individual in the latter class.

Mr. J. W. MORRIS (Trinity Hall, retiring President) then moved, “That this House desires to record its continued confidence in His Majesty’s Government.” He declared himself an ardent supporter of the long-suffering Coalition Government, led by his distinguished compatriot. Recent events had proved the wisdom of holding the General Election in 1918 ; for in recent months there had been chaos and unrest in the country.

What had the Government achieved ? They had been more busy than even the Divorce Courts of this country. In their first session they had achieved more than previous Parliaments in their whole existence. Demobilisation, Peace Treaty, Transport, Housing, Health, Labour Conditions—all these had been dealt with. A financial deficit was admitted ; but just as a boat in shooting past the winning post is quite unable to pull up immediately, so it was impossible at once to return to normal pre-war expenditure.

Mr. Lloyd George had been criticised as a man who made startling political nose-dives, but who invariably managed to straighten out before the crash. Alone of Ministers in Europe he had been in office since 1906. The Prime Minister might yet prove the Androcles who would take the thorn of Irish dissension from the foot of the British Lion.

Press criticism was not representative. Lord Northcliffe used to attack Mr. Lloyd George for promising ninepence for fourpence, and yet did not scruple every day to offer one pennyworth for threepence.

What were the alternatives? Labour had married direct action; he prayed for a speedy divorce. Labour trampled on the rights of others in their short-cuts to the Millennium. The Liberal rump? Not yet. The main opposition to the present Government consisted of disgruntled Liberals, unsolidified Socialists, and for the rest critics, cynics, and Bolsheviks.

Unity, trust, and loyalty would alone enable us to carry through the measures of reform to which we were in sacred duty pledged, and make this country which we loved the greatest and truest among the peoples of the world.

Mr. S. C. ROBERTS (Pembroke, ex-Librarian), in opposing, maintained that if they applied the test of trustworthiness the Government failed. Sometimes they went to the House with a considered policy and threw it to the wolves of chance debate. In finance and administration the Government were inconsistent; their switchback policy might be very exciting, but it did not inspire confidence.

The argument of the hon. proposer could be summed up in the phrase, "Don't shoot the man at the piano—he's doing his best." He, personally, had no murderous intentions against that Coalition orchestra of coupon-holders which played a rather fitful obligato.

The present Government had no clear policy of reconstruction. It had tried to patch up the old society, when it had a chance of building a new one. During the war we had been promised that the Lion of Labour would lie down with the Capitalistic Lamb, but the realities of peace had shattered the illusions of war. The present Government showed no sympathy with the movement for a new social order; it was a mere patchwork of compromise and contradiction.

Mr. J. H. B. NIHILL (Emmanuel, ex-President), in supporting the motion, regretted that his presence was consequent on the inability of members of the Government to be present to speak. Fed from early youth on the pure milk of Liberalism, he had no desire to return to the conditions of 1914; the Coalition spirit was needed. There was no alternative government. We had just emerged from an earthquake—the most stupendous catastrophe that had ever come upon mankind. We were still half covered with the debris, and yet people told us in the sacred name of party to refuse the proffered help of



our fellow survivors. We wanted a strong and stable government. Labour was the party of a section. The scattered elements of Liberalism were under the leadership of one who showed no desire to re-enter the House, and who resembled the Duke of Plaza Toro.

Mr. ROBERT YOUNG, M.P. for Newton, spoke fourth. He declared himself the representative of the new party that would very soon provide an alternative government. The present Government had come into power by means of the greatest political joke ever played. On the day it was born it was entitled to no confidence, and since then it had engendered nothing but unrest. The Premier himself had a sound programme, but both his courage and his supporters failed him.

The Coalition majority had been secured by appeals to national prejudice, and under a representative system of election it would never have been obtained; the Government had one hundred seats too many, and there were sixty minority representatives.

The Government had failed in industry, in foreign policy and in finance. Witness the present coal and railway muddles, the unemployment scandal, and the Russian tangle. The policy seemed to be to allow the bottom dog to remain in his position, and, if needs be, to keep him there. The Government hoped by its muddles to prove the impracticability of the principle of nationalisation.

We wanted a government which would build up its policy on ethical principles; which would say that it was going to put society on a better basis than ever before, a social order in which, without anybody having too much, every honest man would have enough.

Division:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 141. Motion carried by 61 votes.

This concluded the business of the term.

### Criticisms.

ABRAHAM, L. A. (Peterhouse) Undoubtedly a great debater.

Is one of the few who studies the mode of presenting his case. His phrases are captivating. When he uses his Gaelic eloquence it is a treat to listen to him.

ARUNDEL, E. S. (Corpus) So far as criticism can be based on one speech, ours is a favourable one.



- AZIZ, ABDUL (Fitzwilliam Hall) Is keen and persevering. Speaks fluently, but is a trifle heavy.
- BARNES, J. H. (St. John's) One of our idealists. Has an easy, fluent style. Is a little too fond of Brer Fox. Probably he is more cut out to be a bishop than a Cabinet Minister. A sugar coating of humour would make the pill of didactic reasoning easier to swallow.
- BARRAN, H. V. F. (Trinity) Has always good material, but his delivery is too restrained and uniform.
- BERLYN, M. L. (Trinity Hall) Made a promising maiden effort.
- BEST, C. P. (Sidney) Has good ideas, but seems to miss out a few steps in the reasoning when he presents them to the House. His phrases are at times unique. With more vigour in his delivery and a less dogmatic manner, he would be one of the best speakers.
- BOLD, T. A. (Corpus) Only spoke once. He had things worth saying, and knew how to say them.
- BURBURY, A. V. (King's) Speaks rather like an automatic tape machine. All that comes out is new, and most is worth having.
- CONDLIFFE, J. B. (Gonville and Caius) His delivery is somewhat halting. He combines a light touch with effective material, and is always interesting.
- DAVISON, E. L. (St. John's) Is a great acquisition to the House. A poet who speaks good prose without becoming prosy.
- DOBB, M. H. (Pembroke) Began a career in speaking which we hope may prove a notable one.
- DONNELL, R. H., Sub-Lieut. (Trinity) Showed keenness and perseverance. A little more levity and brevity would make him more inspiring.
- DUNNING, N. G. (Peterhouse) Speaks too staccato and in too high a voice, and is inclined to be melodramatic. Always a ready, clear, and forcible speaker.
- EDWARDS, E. E. (Downing) Spoke once during this term. Needs a little more confidence.
- EZARD, B. J. B. (Trinity Hall) Has all the promise and possibilities of a good speaker.

- FIELD, D. T. C. (Emmanuel) When he speaks is like a refreshing sea-breeze wafted across a desert. At times there is a diminutive gale which carries all before it.
- FUNNELL, C. G. (Sidney) Needs a little more life and vigour in his speaking.
- GRIFFITHS, P. J. (Peterhouse) Has a peripatetic manner which is apt to detract from the value of speeches which otherwise—original and clear—would be of value to any debate. Needs to cultivate the persuasive manner.
- GROSE HODGE, G. G. (Pembroke) A well-known name. Is a great and staunch supporter of his party. He possesses good measure of fluency and polish, but needs to study the art of sustaining interest throughout a long speech.
- HECKSTALL-SMITH, H. M. (Sidney) Has a pleasant manner of speaking.
- HENDERSON, A. (Trinity Hall) On all subjects political and on Labour topics is a keen debater. Is broad-minded and invariably well-informed. A little more practice will make his speeches of great value.
- HERMAN, J. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Interesting, original and fluent. Has spoken frequently and has always made a useful contribution.
- HOROBIN, I. M. (Sidney) Most serious when humorous ; most abstruse when straightforward. One suspected an attempt at a mild leg-pull of the House.
- JOHNSTON, W. D. (Christ's) Spoke once only ; effected the felicitous alliance of brevity and interest.
- LAWLEY, F. E. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Quite one of the most fluent speakers, but is always on the war-path and deadly serious. Needs to temper his eloquence with moderation.
- LE MAITRE, A. S. (St. John's) Is too modest to give us the full benefit of his humour and inventiveness, but, when his ire is roused, he is as fluent as the best. Like a rich meat pie—once you break the crust there's plenty in it.
- MACPHERSON, I. (Trinity) Showed all the latent attributes of a good speaker. We hope these talents will fructify and flourish.

- MORGAN, S. C. (Trinity) Is our *tour de force*. Men don't go out while he is speaking, and they flock in to hear him. On opponents of Liberalism he pounces with the swoop of a hawk. Possesses the priceless gift of originality and has a delightfully rich vein of humour. Let the Government beware of him!
- MORRIS, D. (Christ's) Broke the ice of silence with grace and success.
- MORRIS, E. H. F. (Christ's) Has a charming manner. Suave and persuasive. At times his ideas are so plentifully ebullient that one wonders whether he is not inebriated with the exuberance of his own fertility of mind.
- MOUNTBATTEN, Lord Louis, Sub-Lieut. R.N. (Christ's) Possesses the "charm of colloquialism." Has a ready wit and a genius for turning opponents' arguments. Is always an attractive speaker, especially in the unprepared parts of his speech. When he has nothing to say he still says it very nicely.
- NORTH, J. F. A. (Downing) Is inclined to be sensational and even bitter, but possesses the gifts of fluency and originality.
- NORTHAM, R. (Queens') We wish he had had more opportunity to speak, for the impression he created was first-rate.
- PAISH, F. W. (Trinity) Shows a consistently Liberal line of thought and expresses himself pleasantly and clearly.
- PEDLER, T. S. (Queens') Made two short but useful speeches.
- PERRY, R. W. (Peterhouse) A good speaker. Brisk, fresh, and amusing.
- PHILLIPS, G. G. (Trinity) Showed all the promise of a good speaker.
- PREST, C. P. (St. John's) Spoke but once, and was then reasonable and useful.
- PRITCHARD, E. A. B. (King's) Spoke sound sense, but spoke it abstrusely.
- PRYKE, W. W. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Has latent debating ability which needs development and practice.
- PURCELL, V. W. W. S. (Trinity) Has not been heard as often as would have been wished.
- RAHIM, M. I. (Pembroke) Made a good start.

- RAIKES, H. V. A. (Trinity) With practice should become an effective speaker.
- RAM, V. S. (Emmanuel) Fluent, forcible, ferocious. But speed is not the chief factor that makes for good speaking.
- RICHARDSON, J. H. (Emmanuel) Should become a useful debater. He thinks well and delivers well. Needs more sparkle and more confidence.
- ROOM, L. E. (Corpus) Showed genuine humour, which covers a multitude of sins.
- RUNCIMAN, W. L. (Trinity) Has given proof of hereditary debating ability, but has too often thought that while speech is silver, silence is golden. A true Liberal. Eh bien!
- RUSSELL, A. W. (Gonville and Caius) One of the many "first offenders" whom it is so difficult to criticise.
- SAMPSON, E. W. (Corpus) Spoke but once; was then useful and interesting.
- SELLS, A. L. (Sidney) With more confidence and vigour he would be an effective speaker.
- SHARP, G. G. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Has a direct and straightforward manner, and makes his points in a telling way. Quite one of the best speakers—logical, moderate, and invariably interesting.
- SMELLIE, K. (St. John's) Made a promising first speech.
- STEERS, D. H. (St. John's) Soldier and Imperialist. His speeches were but too few. Has a definite view and presents it well.
- STRONG, P. N. W. (Selwyn) Relies rather much on notes, resembling a torrent fed from copious tributaries. At times rather too forced. Has a pleasant manner and well thought-out material.
- SWAN, T. (Emmanuel) A good debater. Is inclined to be stiff.
- THEOBALD, G. W. (Emmanuel) One of the discoveries of the term. Has the power of compelling attention, and a mellowness and moderation of voice which adds to the force of his speeches. As a debater has shown himself an ingenious inventor of vote-winning arguments. Has a keen sense of humour.
- THOMPSON, A. C. (Trinity Hall) Possesses debating ability and originality, but is not sufficiently forcible.

- THORNTON, D. L. (Magdalene) Has a style suitable for a directors' meeting, and subject matter as abstruse as if for an address to the British Association.
- TRACEY, C. B. (St. John's) A forcible speaker ; perhaps a trifle too much so.
- WALKER, E. R. C. (Emmanuel) Has a sly form of humour and is rather conscious of it. His speeches are always good.
- WARREN, D. D. (Corpus) Needs to make his points more slowly and forcibly.
- WATSON, R. E. (St. Catharine's) Keen and capable. Should do well at the Union. "A stern, unbending Tory." Needs to vary his voice.
- WILSON, H. L. (Emmanuel) Made one speech which we hoped would be followed by others.
- WILSON, R. K. (Trinity Hall) As far as he went was good, and we hope he will go farther.
- YEATMAN, H. M. (Pembroke) Is demobilised, but not yet Demosthenes. But he may be if he cultivates the talent which lies low.

## Lent Term, 1920.

- President* : Mr. G. H. Shakespeare (Emmanuel).  
*Vice-President* : Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel).  
*Secretary* : Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse).  
*Treasurer* : Mr. J. E. McTaggart, Litt.D. (Trinity).  
*Librarian* : Mr. B. G. Brown, M.A. (Trinity).  
*Steward* : Mr. E. Bullough, M.A. (Gonville and Caius).  
*Committee* : Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke).  
                  Mr. J. H. Barnes (St. John's).  
                  Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's).  
                  Sub-Lieut. Lord Louis Mountbatten (Christ's).  
                  Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel).  
                  Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall).
- 

### FIRST DEBATE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 20th, 1920.

Motion : " *That this House deplores the action of the Senate of the United States of America in regard to the Peace Treaty.*"

Our demobilised Demosthenes was by this time satisfied with the conclusions of his domestic post-philippics, and, believing that the home front had sufficiently engaged the clarity of his thought and the wings of his eloquence, was anxious to express his opinion on the American impasse.

Two ex-Presidents, Mr. Harold Wright and Mr. H. D. Henderson, bore the brunt of the debate, and gave a refreshing display of *back-chat*.

"My friend" (Mr. Henderson), explained Mr. Wright, "has sufficient acumen and common sense to agree with me on every subject except two. In the first place I deplore the attitude of America to the Peace Treaty; and, secondly, I believe that Lord Northcliffe is a greater danger than our Prime Minister." It must be confessed that the House (not unlike 'that other House') is never so elevated as when speakers descend to personalities.

The debate was somewhat marred by the absence of a clear issue and decisive opinions. In fact, as a member confided to the President afterwards, "without frequent reference to the paper, it was difficult to determine whether any speaker was expressing approbation or reprobation."



Mr. T. SWAN (Emmanuel) gave a short sketch of American politics. Mr. Wilson had failed to carry the Peace Treaty because he had disregarded the coalition principle. The result was that policy was directed by a dead Washington rather than a live Wilson. The Peace Treaty had not been ratified because the "League of Nations" had been included in it. Had the Treaty been signed there would have arisen a strong alliance between Great Britain, France and America. Now the League had become a mutual benefit society, with the three great countries—America, Germany, Russia excluded. So constituted, it could never be a success. The result was much bad feeling between America and ourselves. America emerged from the war the only creditor nation, and had failed to show that moral responsibility which every nation owed to the world. Mr. Swan gave a good definition of "stray nation" in his "Irish, Germans and others."

Mr. IAN MACPHERSON (Trinity) made his maiden appearance as a speaker on the paper. His attitude to the motion was most original, if not convincing. Competition and criticism being the essential elements of progress, the League, on which apparently he turned an eye of mild favour, could only be strengthened by American opposition. Surely, Labour troubles had saved the present Coalition. His argument amounted to this—that the only way to establish the League on sure foundations was to start by undermining them. How great is the influence of Mr. Chesterton on modern thought!

Mr. HAROLD WRIGHT (ex-President, Pembroke), after an amusing interchange of pleasantries with the fourth speaker, ventured to disagree with the proposer's advocacy of "a grand alliance," which he termed "a counsel of despair." The last speaker's ingenious theory as to the value of opposition he referred to as an attractive by-product. A League of Nations with an Opposition was a contradiction in terms. America had thrown out the Peace Treaty because she could not swallow article 10 of the Covenant. This article had been called "the heart of the League,"\* embodying, as it did, the principle of a

\*"CASES OF AGGRESSION.

"ARTICLE 10.

"The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

defensive alliance. Whereas the Senate might have modified the selfish aims of the European nations, it did but wish to graft on to the Treaty its own equally selfish terms. How much might have been saved the world during the last fifty years if every aggressor nation had been met by an economic boycott and the defensive alliance which article 10 would establish!

Mr. H. D. HENDERSON (ex-President, Emmanuel) expressed the hope that America would join the League of Nations if article 10 were modified. Why should America, by article 10, guarantee to maintain territorial arrangements of which even the last speaker had grave misgivings? She wanted to leave herself free to make war or not according to the merits of each particular case, and not to bind herself by a possibly out-worn promise. A mere mechanical guarantee was no more the heart of a living organism like the League than a criminal code or police force was the heart of a country. The Council of the League represented the vested interests of the great European nations, and America would never support such vested interests. War was the inevitable result of modern diplomacy, and no State should guarantee to wage war against another State which would probably be only technically the aggressor.

Mr. BUTLER (ex-President, Trinity), in a speech showing complete mastery of his subject, explained that the much disputed article 10 was the real safeguard of the smaller nations against sudden and brutal aggression.

There also spoke :—*For*—Mr. L. A. Abraham (Secretary Peterhouse), Mr. J. H. Barnes (St. John's).

*Against*—Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel), Mr. L. V. Snowman (Downing), Mr. E. W. Sampson (Corpus).

Division :—Ayes, 229 ; Noes, 117. Majority For, 112.

## SECOND DEBATE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 27th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House desires to express its approval of the Government's proposals for the solution of the Irish question.*"

The Irish question might be called the furred deposit of our political kettle. But, given an Irishman and some hot water, the kettle is never too furred to boil. A solution that might conciliate in 1914 becomes almost a

source of irritation in 1920. The hope of Home Rule deferred makes the heart of an Irishman sick, and only to be comforted by making Ireland a Republic—a cure that this country is hardly likely to accept. Even granting, they argue, that we shall look after our own affairs less efficiently than England can, it is better “to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven.” This is the essence of the dilemma.

T.R.H. Prince Albert and Prince Henry attended the debate, which proved of lively interest.

Mr. R. E. WATSON (St. Catharine's), much as he disliked the present Government, saw some sanity in their Irish proposals. Three ways of meeting the difficulty had been suggested. The first was an Irish Republic. This was impossible for a people consisting of two races distinct in religion as in ideas. The second solution, the 1914 scheme, disregarded the legitimate claims of Ulster, while the third—the complete separation of Ulster—disregarded the claims of Ireland. Therefore, we were driven to adopt the Government proposals of two separate legislatures with a joint council, working on the federal system. Surely this was an honest attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable. What folly to talk of Ireland for the Irish, when the first President of the Republic was a Portuguese Jew!

Mr. P. N. W. STRONG (Selwyn) started in a light vein. Addressing the President (Mr. Shakespeare), he said, “As your distinguished ancestor, sir, Lord Bacon, said.” He was not allowed to continue. “I wish to remind the honourable gentleman,” interrupted the President, “that this chair is quite impersonal and has no ancestry.” Mr. Strong neatly turned the laugh against the President by apologising, and adding, “As Mr. William Shakespeare once said.” Continuing, he indulged in a perfect medley of metaphor. Mr. Lloyd George had taken a free kick for the Government, but had only hit the cross-bar and failed to score. Ireland had been sent an empty envelope labelled “Dominion Home Rule.” The proposer had been hoodwinked because he had not looked inside. Self-determination was the principle for which the last war had been fought. How did our treatment of Ireland square with this principle or with the League of Nations? The only solution was self-determination for both north and south.

Mr. W. H. RAMSBOTTOM (ex-President, Emmanuel) started by pointing out that the last speaker's ancestor, Strongbow, was responsible for all the trouble in the

north of Ireland. Mr. Strong interrupted, "I am not an Irishman." "Neither was Strongbow," replied Mr. Ramsbottom. Continuing, he showed how the present proposal of a Federal Government lay half-way between the Union which had failed, and complete separation which was impossible. Dominion Home Rule was not applicable to a people so near our shores, and who were so inextricably bound up with ourselves. Certain powers had to be reserved. Ireland would still be taxed imperially to pay for certain services in accordance with the federal principle, and the Empire would be proud to follow Ireland's example. Ulster and the rest of Ireland were to be united in a loose Union. Australia showed how effective such loose Unions could be. In South Africa, on the contrary, too strong a Union was the cause of continual friction. The Irish could offer no sensible solution for themselves. The Government were therefore trying the expedient of a little political science.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Secretary, Peterhouse) is the son of a former Nationalist M.P., and on such questions speaks with intimate knowledge and feeling. The Irish, he explained, were not peculiar savages, as the supporters of the motion imagined. De Valera was neither a Portuguese nor a Jew. "Ulsters" occurred all over Europe, but the Peace Conference dealt with them by subjecting the minority to the majority. Even in Ulster 48 per cent. of the people were non-Unionists. No scheme had a chance of success unless the Irish were given the control of customs and excise. Control of taxes was the essence of liberty. Consent, not force, was the only justification of Empire. Repression always led to further outrage. Ireland should be trusted and treated as a nation with her own ideals and tradition. She wanted Liberty, not Charity.

There also spoke :—*For*—Mr. J. W. Morris (ex-President, Trinity Hall), Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke), Mr. G. M. Graham (King's), Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's), Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's), Mr. H. V. A. Raikes (Trinity), Mr. J. H. Richardson (Emmanuel).

*Against*—Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall), Mr. G. G. Phillips (Trinity), Mr. F. W. Paish (Trinity), Mr. J. A. McCoy (Christ's), Mr. V. S. Ram (Emmanuel), Mr. W. D. Johnston (Christ's), Mr. M. U. S. Jung (Christ's).

Division :—Ayes, 197 ; Noes, 131. Majority For, 66.

## THIRD DEBATE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3rd, 1920.

Motion : " *That this House views with suspicion any proposals for the Nationalisation of Mines.*"

The question of Nationalisation is the most prominent question of the day, and tends to be the great line of cleavage between parties. The Coalition stands or falls by its attitude, believing that private control and free competition supply the bases of national prosperity. Labour lisps that magic word although it were the "Open Sesame" to every road of progress, and, straining out the gnat of capitalism, swallows the bureaucratic camel. Asquithianism is undecided, either damning with faint praise or praising with faint damns.

The debate was a good one, and may be described in the verse of our *Granta* correspondent :

" Full deep the tide of talking  
It did both flow and ebb  
With frequent reference to Sidney  
And Cole and others of their kidney  
Caught in the Fabian Webb."

H.R.H. Prince Henry was present, accompanied by Commander Grieg.

Mr. G. G. SHARP (Fitzwilliam Hall) showed that it was foolish to argue that the Sankey Commission pledged the Government to any policy. Nationalisation meant a gigantic central Bureaucracy, and probably a large subsidy raised by taxing industry. The Government control of telegraphs had shown a loss of 30 millions sterling. Self-interest, blink the fact as we might, was the mainspring of human conduct. There was no self-interest in a bureaucrat. It was said that coal would be cheaper, but Mr. Webb, in answer 1226, had doubted whether the price of coal could be lowered. Nor would the danger of strikes be obviated according to the expressed opinions of Labour leaders. The Duckham Scheme was a fair interpretation of the Sankey Report.

Mr. A. HENDERSON (Trinity Hall) is to the Union what his father is to the House of Commons—the official voice of Labour. He was pleased to see the re-union of Liberal and Tory at last in the proposer and third speaker. In considering the working of the mines we were faced with the alternatives of private ownership or State ownership. The



former stood condemned beyond reprieve by the Sankey Commission, seven of whom voted for Nationalisation. High dividends for shareholders and security of life for the miners were incompatible. The present system of barriers led to loss of production. The public were tired of the spasmodic changes in the price of coal and of the profiteering of owners. Joint industrial control was a different thing from Bureaucracy.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE (Pembroke) pointed out that the present system was a hybrid of private ownership and State control. Surely the pre-war system had been justified by its fruits. Fifty years had seen production increased five-fold. Deaths had decreased to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per 1,000. As to mine owners profiteering, the excess profit duty had prevented that. The opposer had hoped, trusted, believed, expected—he might have been a fraudulent company promoter. The country would be bankrupt by buying out the owners, setting up a huge State department, and providing a large subsidy.

Mr. C. L. WISEMAN, Peterhouse (Ex-Secretary), doubted whether the coal industry had built up the Empire. He believed rather that the Empire had built up the coal industry. Nationalisation depended on three fundamental facts. Minerals were national wealth, a national necessity, and were limited in quantity. No one should profit out of a necessity. Conference after conference was held between the Prime Minister and the miners, but the door of Downing Street stood between the interested few and the unenlightened public. Joint control need not abolish private enterprise. State control did not necessarily mean Bureaucracy. Experiments were needed to meet changed conditions. For the permanent official would be substituted the mining expert.

A clear and convincing exposition.

The debate, being thrown open, produced much dialectic skill. Among the most promising of the younger speakers we should perhaps mention Mr. Griffiths, Mr. Richardson and Mr. Dobb.

There also spoke :—*For*—Mr. S. C. Morgan (Trinity), Mr. A. E. Brierley (Peterhouse), Mr. L. E. Room (Corpus), Sub-Lieut. R. H. Donnell (Trinity), Mr. L. V. Snowman (Downing).

*Against*—Mr. D. M. Reid (Vice-President, Emmanuel),

Mr. P. J. Griffiths (Peterhouse), Mr. F. E. Lawley (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. J. H. Richardson (Emmanuel), Mr. M. H. Dobb (Pembroke).

Division :—Ayes, 148 ; Noes, 105. Majority For, 43.

#### FOURTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10th, 1920.

Motion : “ *That this House considers the pre-war policy of the Liberal Government both deceptive and dangerous.* ”

We must confess that the subject of this debate caused much criticism. “Why not let sleeping dogs lie ? ” said some, “The debate will serve that very purpose,” replied our last and only Tory. Our personal reluctance was over-borne by a chance of securing the services of Viscount Haldane himself. A hundred years hence, when all should be forgotten, if not forgiven, examiners in the History Tripos will delight in questions such as the above motion, adding, of course, “discuss Haldane’s liability.” In which case candidates would do well to borrow this book from the Stanley Brown of the 21st century and read how Haldane discussed his own liability. Few men in public life have suffered such vile calumny or such Fleet Street effervescence. But question the preparedness of this country as we may, no sane man can deny that, in as far as we were prepared, it was in no small measure due to Lord Haldane himself. Haldane’s policy we may criticise, Haldane’s genius, sincerity, and patriotism we cannot but admire.

Mr. E. H. F. MORRIS (Christ’s) explained that he was acting as the advanced guard to the main attack, but hoped to reveal the enemy’s weak points and to engage his Territorial Reserve. The workers had been banquetted with rare and refreshing fruit, the vicarious hospitality of Mr. Lloyd George. We heard much of Liberal Principle, and he supposed its charm lay in its elusiveness. A good example of it was shown by the Trades Disputes Act, 1906. The Attorney-General had been forced to eat his own words and Trade Unions had been put beyond the reach of the law. Though in pre-war days there had not been the same need for economy, the Navy had not been kept at a two-keel-to-one standard, while the Army had been weakened. The National Insurance scheme was an extravagant and trumpety offer. The working classes

needed not ninepence for fourpence, but a greater share of responsibility. The only consistent thread of Liberal principle was the desire to set class against class.

°Mr. J. W. MORRIS (ex-President, Trinity Hall) took up the proposer's metaphor of an attack by an advanced guard. "The hon. proposer," he said, "promised me a barrage and all he gave me was a barrage of red herrings. Behold, I was looking for a tank, and my friend rides into battle on a motor scooter." Before 1901 the Trade Union, like any other unincorporated body, was not liable for its torts. The Taft Vale decision, however, had fixed them with liability. All that the Trades Disputes Act had done was to restore their former immunity. The corner-stone of the debate was the Liberal attitude to the German menace. Their policy had two aspects, the preparatory and the preventive. The pre-war atmosphere of suspicion was the outcome of the Tory attitude. The expeditionary force was the child of the Liberal Government. The war had only confirmed his conviction that the Liberals were to blame not for working after peace, but for not having striven with greater efforts.

Sir ERNEST WILD, K.C., M.P. for Upton Division of West Ham, expressed himself embarrassed at being confronted with Lord Haldane, and felt sympathy with Ko-Ko when he said to Pooh-bah, "Come over here where the Chancellor can't hear us." However, he had devoted some time to reading his Lordship's book. He noticed that the publisher, in his introduction, had written that this book was a complete vindication of Lord Haldane's policy. He regarded this, however, as "a plea in mitigation of sentence." It was the pre-war Liberal policy that called forth his criticism and he felt sure that the noble Lord would understand that, if he said hard things, no attack was being made on his personal sincerity. By pre-war Liberalism he meant that policy advocated by the noisy faddists of the party, who trusted to catch-words for their votes and class prejudice and passion for their appeal. The Liberals deserved no credit for their elementary foresight in maintaining a strong Navy. Some Tories were Chauvinists perhaps, but the whole party was at least patriotic. The greatest condemnation of the Liberals was that they had never taken the people into their confidence. This country was misled, and France was dispirited. Even the leading Liberal journal on

August 3rd, 1914, had declared that the trouble on the continent was not worth the bones of a single British soldier. Lastly, Germany had been led to rely on our neutrality. Had she been informed that we should help France if she were attacked, she would have thought twice before plunging Europe into war.

Sir Ernest Wild made a very clear and convincing case, illuminated by a sparkling humour and frequent references to Lord Haldane's book, out of which he made much capital.

VISCOUNT HALDANE, on rising to speak, was given a tremendous ovation, and it was several minutes before he could make a start. He has a delightful and easy manner of speaking, and obtains his effect never by brilliant phraseology, seldom by oratorical appeal, but by his well-balanced and logical presentation of facts. One feels that he is thinking his way along from premise to premise until one almost irresistibly agrees with his conclusions. And, behind all, there is the convincing charm of a great personality.

He started by explaining that he was under a great disadvantage because he could not say "Mine enemy hath written a book." Liberal legislation had been much criticised, but there was not the same haste to repeal it. Past politics were easily solved in the light of subsequent revelation. What were the difficulties of the old Liberal Government? In 1904 it found the country particularly unprepared. Their policy was to strike a balance between two conflicting principles. In the first place, they wanted to clear away the atmosphere of suspicion and prevent war by delaying it until it became impossible. A new party was growing up in Germany—a peace party, anxious to drive out the Militarists and to set up a constitutional government. In the second place, war always being possible, they had to decide on the best method of maintaining national security. Lord Roberts' scheme of National Military Service was discredited by the Imperial Defence Committee, for invasion, even if possible, would have been ineffectual. Conscription was discountenanced even by Conservatives. The only feasible scheme was to maintain a strong Navy, a swiftly mobilised and rapidly striking expeditionary force and a Territorial Army behind it as a reserve. This expeditionary force would secure the Channel ports and prevent Germany

using them as a base. The situation was too grave for public discussion, and the declaration of open alliances would have precipitated war. As to Germany mistaking our policy, she had been clearly warned that she must not rely on our neutrality, were France attacked. To say that the organisation of our army had weakened it, was like saying that a boxer, with every ounce of superfluous flesh turned to muscle, was unfit to fight. In conclusion, he said, "This is our record, and we feel that we can hold up our heads and tell it out with pride. Our only regret is that we did not do more to encourage better feeling with Germany."

There also spoke :—*For*—Mr. G. G. Coulton (St. John's), Sub-Lieut. R. H. Donnell (Trinity).

*Against*—Mr. S. C. Morgan (Trinity), Mr. J. B. Palmer (St. John's).

Division :—Ayes, 316 ; Noes, 441. Majority Against, 125.

#### FIFTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House considers that the adoption of any system of Compulsory Military Training will not further the interests of Great Britain.*"

The President was responsible for a poor debate by choosing an uninspiring subject, with the weight of opinion predominantly on one side. To any Government which proposed a scheme of conscription would be given the short but irresistible answer of "You try !" The life of a Government, like the life of the law, is "not logic, but experience." However, the debate served its intended purpose of offering a tempting bait to the maiden speaker, and we will leave it at that.

Mr. D. T. C. FIELD (Emmanuel) showed how the adoption of any compulsory scheme of training would be playing into the hands of that noisy little socialistic group. The safety of the Dominions depended on free communications, which were only maintainable by an efficient Navy. Our only military need was a strong expeditionary force. Compulsion would be a costly experiment, and only excusable to meet a menace of invasion which was no menace at all. Any attempt to be dominant by land and sea had ruined every empire that set out to achieve it.



The lessons of history, from the days of Carthage to the time of the Dutch ascendancy, showed the folly of substituting land power for sea power. Our strength lay in the proper use of our traditional arm.

Mr. C. P. BEST (Sidney Sussex) believed that Democracy and Conscription were not incompatible. Socialists on the Continent were in favour of military training. The duty of defence was a matter above party, and should be equally distributed. War was still a decided possibility, and failure to realise this led to improvised preparations when the danger had arisen. The essence of statesmanship was to look ahead and be prepared.

Mr. G. W. THEOBALD (Emmanuel) suspected that Conscription was the ghost behind the motion. Having founded the League of Nations on the grave of Prussianism, it seemed a pity to dig it up and re-establish it in this country. Education and industry would suffer. In the event of another European war, we should be the better prepared if we relied on a strong Navy and a skeleton Army capable of expansion. A soldier was not built in a day, and a short training was absurdly inadequate. Apart from the desirability of the scheme, this country would not tolerate it. This was a time of crisis, and unrest, and only the spark of compulsion was needed to fire the powder.

Mr. G. G. COULTON (St. John's) is as ardent over National Service as Cobden was over Free Trade. He has advocated his pet scheme in season and out of season. In 1914 he carried a motion in favour of national service in the same house by one vote. His witnesses range from Hannibal to Hadley; in fact, history is his handmaiden, but the prophet, not without honour even in this country, fails to proselytise.

He was surprised that we should be prevented from making adequate provision for our safety for fear of offending either Germany or Bob Smillie. He doubted the proposer's interpretation of history. The overthrow of Carthage by Rome was the triumph of the professional over the amateur. Sea-power and land-power were not incompatible. At least four-fifths of the retired admirals believed in National Military Service. During the Hundred Years War, when we lost command of the sea for twenty years, it was our national citizen army that kept France at bay. Conscription was not anti-socialistic. It was the essence of Democracy to put a bank-manager under the

command of his bank clerk. Nor would industry suffer. Experts had attributed Germany's industrial success to her military training. He had written to Swiss business men on the subject, and the great majority had expressed themselves in favour of it. Had we adopted Lord Roberts' scheme, it was not improbable that continental countries would have followed our lead. Military training would then have been standardised, and every nation would have been strong in defence and weak in offence. Thus war would have been impossible.

There also spoke :—*For*—Mr. E. R. C. Walker (Emmanuel), Mr. G. G. Sharp (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. E. W. Sampson (Corpus), Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall), Mr. J. A. Gemmell (Emmanuel), Mr. A. E. Brierley (Peterhouse), Mr. E. H. Denyer (Selwyn).

*Against*—Mr. C. B. Bowman (Sidney), Mr. R. E. Watson (St. Catharine's), Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's), Mr. L. V. Snowman (Downing), Mr. C. L. Bennet (Jesus), Major D. H. Steers (St. John's).

Neutral : Mr. J. Herman (Fitzwilliam Hall).

Division :—Ayes, 114 ; Noes, 47. Majority For, 67.

Of the above we pick out two maiden speakers.

Mr. Gemmell made a most amusing speech. His humour is enhanced by appearing to be unconscious.

Mr. Bennet gave a most interesting and lucid account of the history of military service in New Zealand.

#### SIXTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House considers that the time is now ripe for a Labour Government.*"

The sixth debate was perhaps the most successful of the term. It was the Inter-Varsity debate, a custom which had lapsed since 1914. The Oxford Union Society sent three representatives. A distinguished visitor is usually invited on such an occasion, and we were fortunate in securing Mr. Churchill. The House was one of the fullest in the history of the Union, over a thousand being present. Two hours before the debate was to start, members began to take up their positions. By eight o'clock the hall was the scene of unusual excitement. Members relieved the tedium of waiting by hitting each other over the head with the lathes torn from the hired chairs. Every available

standing space was occupied, the crowd surging up to the Presidential chair in a manner reminiscent of a football scrum. Several late-comers actually climbed in through the window, and were borne from shoulder to shoulder until they found room for their feet.

Hundreds of members stood patiently during the first five speeches to hear Mr. Churchill, and their patience was amply rewarded.

T.R.H. Prince Albert and Prince Henry, accompanied by Commander Grieg, were present at the debate.

Mr. E. J. LASSEN (Lincoln, Oxford) proposed the motion. Labour was now fit in policy and personnel to succeed the Coalition, which had brought us to the verge of revolution. The Constantinople policy was a violation of promises; India was the scene of fearful massacres; Ireland was ruled by tyranny. The attitude to Russia showed two conflicting policies. Like the National Party, the Government consisted of only two members. The Secretary for War thought Labour unfit to govern. He was certainly a judge of fitness! Labour was frequently called revolutionary, but it was difficult to be revolutionary in five years. Even the *Morning Post* had admitted that Labour had a policy, and that was conclusive testimony (Our friend Mr. Peaker, the *Morning Post* representative, was seen to be writing hard.) Mr. Lassen made a very forcible attack on the Coalition in the short compass of twenty minutes. He reminded us of a Roman candle which has to make so many explosions while the powder lasts.

Sub-Lieut. Lord LOUIS MOUNTBATTEN (Christ's) congratulated the proposer on having dealt with everything but the motion. He detected a blatant contradiction. The proposer had said that Russia was starving, and, later, that she had been prevented from exporting her natural resources. It was useless to deny that Labour Government meant government by a class as much as if all "those rotten dukes" held the reins. We should be ruled by sectional interests, by the champions of any workers with a "bleat on." The miners had expressed no real opinion on nationalisation. They had been asked to vote on four questions, a six-hour day, a 30% increase in wages, nationalisation, and raising the German blockade. Naturally they voted "yes." Labour was still suffering from growing pains. It might be ready in the future to assume

power, but, for the present, ignorance of foreign politics made the experiment dangerous.

Mr. D. M. REID (Vice-President, Emmanuel) thought the present a time of re-shuffling. Men of all parties were being attracted to Labour, which alone had a policy and a vision. It was a great wonder that Labour was not more restive, considering how the Sankey Report had been "the sport of politicians." The Labour Party appealed not only to a class, but to nine-tenths of the country, and counted as adherents both the horny-handed and the intellectual. Why was not the time ripe now? Eight Labour members served in the Coalition, and showed themselves worthy of confidence. And yet it was urged that they lacked experience. Put Labour in power, and the death-knell of Bolshevism is rung.

Mr. C. GALLOP (Balliol, President of the Oxford Union), after the usual complimentary preamble, expressed doubt whether any two Labour leaders were agreed on one policy. All of them made a flourish of "ends" without "the means" to accomplish. They were like the wonderful "eight" portrayed by a lady novelist, who wrote, "All rowed fast, but none so fast as Bryan." He emerged from the war an unrepentant Liberal. How would Labour solve international questions? They might not desire the break up of empire, but they would probably achieve it.

Mr. Gallop served up a delightful dish from an old joint!

Mr. C. B. RAMAGE (Pembroke, Oxford) was afraid that the Coalition, like the poor, would be always with us. Its members only swam together by sinking their differences. What was the result? Conscription was still in force; "D.O.R.A." walked abroad throughout the land; a hundred millions had been squandered on the internal affairs of Russia; no houses as yet appeared above ground, and unrest was prevalent everywhere. The massing of forces against Labour, Lord Robert Cecil had termed idiotic. The time was overripe. Until we had nationalisation there would be no increase of output. That was now a psychological question. Most economic experts were in favour of a capital levy to pay off the huge war debt. It was folly to say that Labour would destroy the Empire.

Mr. Ramage was reasonable and convincing, and has the first essential of a speaker—personality.



Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL, M.P. (Secretary of State for War), on rising to speak, had an enthusiastic reception. It was only the week before that he had made his great attack on Labour at Dundee, and he was still full of fight. In fact, he is always the embodiment of Browning's lines, "I was ever a fighter, so one fight more, the best and the last." Mr. Churchill has the distinguishing quality of courage. As a debater he has few equals. He combines a picturesque imagination and striking phraseology with a compelling logic. Above all, no public speaker to-day, with the exception of Mr. Asquith, has such a mastery of English.

Mr. Churchill said that he noticed a threat running "diminuendo" through the speeches of the proposer and seconder of the motion. Were we to have a settlement by force or argument? "Let us have sarcasm, argument, invective, and all the weapons of the human mind, but don't make a squalid threat to take away a man's coal!" Labour would not show its ability to govern by threats. He doubted whether men who organised a lightning strike could manage the affairs of the British Empire. The Coalition stood by argument. He was delighted at being attacked, but he claimed the right of hitting back. "Now" was the important word in the motion. He never said that the time would never be ripe. Some day the party might get new leaders, new elements, a new outlook, or even be united. At present Labour did not represent one-fifth of the workers. He had more sympathy with the real workers than the newcomers into the party. It was all very well to offer yourself for the commanding positions and call yourself Labour. Let the Vice-President talk to his constituency about "horny hands." In spite of the conversion of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Ponsonby, Lord Haldane and Admiral Fisher, Labour remained a class party. Under our present system, government was carried on by the whole nation, a great commonwealth. Absolute equality of opportunity had not been achieved, but there was at least an open door to all classes. Our Prime Minister had risen from a cottage. But Labour made and kept men equal. (Cries of "No.") "It's no good saying 'No,'" said Mr. Churchill, "it is so; dead equality except for the political bosses."

Our Capitalist system, with all its abuses, was an infinitely flexible method of testing relative merit. Do away with it, and leaders are chosen by political wire-



pulling. The substitution of a vague love of a commune or a Soviet for personal initiative would take away all incentive. Capital was the accumulated prudence and thrift of mankind. Without it there could be no command and no control, but only anarchy. Therefore, purge our system, but don't overthrow it.

Labour advocated self-determination as a universal remedy, whereas such a principle should be modified according to the merits of time and place.

In pursuing the glittering image of Internationalism, we should be careful not to skip a stage, but should remember how much the national ideal has meant. There was a great difference between the Trade-Union that had fought for minimum standards and one that was the revolutionary centre of strike threats. It was a mistake to believe that Lenin and Trotsky overthrew the Tzar; they overthrew the Russian Republic. Once a nation goes off the rails it goes from bloody massacre to red terror, from red terror to military dictatorship. "Look at Russia," he said, "the tyranny of force and terror changed to a tyranny of ideas and formula. Industrial conscription—12 hours a day, the abolition of the right of free speech and meeting, destruction of the Parliament lately established, destruction of most of the members of that Parliament! What a melancholy conclusion!"

In conclusion, he asked how long a moderate Labour Government would last in this country. Russia gave the answer. "The immediate accession to power of Labour would be contrary to the intention of those who won the war. It would weaken our country all over the world, damage its credit, and injure its powers of reparation."

This was one of the most brilliant speeches we have ever heard at the Union. When Mr. Churchill was painting his vivid word-picture of the Russian tragedy, the atmosphere was almost electrical, and when he added "what a melancholy conclusion," in a tone half pity and half contempt, the House broke into a roar of laughter.

Division :—Ayes, 265 ; Noes, 651. Majority Against, 386.

SEVENTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, MARCH 2nd, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House deploras the tendency of the modern novel.*"

After the grey sombre, and often sordid atmosphere

that surrounded political controversy, it was decided to give Demosthenes a chance of meandering with a mazy motion through the green pastures of literary fancy. The debate was very well attended, and proved refreshing and restful. The presence of Sir Arthur Quiller Couch, or "Q," as he is more popularly known, put a great strain on the timbers supporting the gallery.

Mr. J. H. BARNES (St. John's) explained that by modern novelists he meant all those living at the present day, with the exception of Thomas Hardy—the last of the great Victorians. To-day we had about 2,000 novelists! The two essentials of a good novel were an inspiring idea and perfect technique. He condemned modern writers because they could find no mean between an absolute hero and an utter villain. The novel displayed little technique, and showed signs of hurried composition. It was inspired by commercialism instead of fame. Love was sensual and realism revolting. That kind of stuff sold better. The function of the novelist was to present beautiful ideas in a beautiful form.

Mr. E. L. DAVISON (St. John's) is already known as one of the most promising of Cambridge poets, and he spoke with conviction. Modern novels should be judged by "the peaks," and not by the shilling shockers. Modern writers like Kipling, Conrad, and Mackenzie suffered nothing by comparison with the old school. Jane Austen was a realist, and modern realism would be termed romantic by our grandchildren just as we referred to the romantic realism of Dickens. Psycho-analysis was as old as Shakespeare, and there was no better example of it than Iago or Othello. Art dealt with every side of life and with every tendency, and must therefore be realistic. Joseph Conrad excelled equally at characterisation, realism or romance. Poets and novelists were groping after an indefinable something.

Professor Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH said that we lived in an age when every idea produced an explosion. In self-defence he often felt like cutting his own—lecture. Tendency was either moral or . . . artistic. He was not concerned with morals, of other people. There was no tendency of the novel to-day, there were many. He was educated in a school in which for the author to emerge from the background and chat about his characters was a piece of artistic ill-breeding. The characters should be put on the

stage and left to speak for themselves. Preaching was a modern vice for which we had to thank Shaw and Wells, although under their treatment it was tolerable. The destiny of the world rested more safely on Antony and Cleopatra than on Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb. He deplored the tendency of novels to be a transcript of life, following the hero from birth until the time . . . he was separated from his wife. He could not condemn sufficiently an author who took occasion to befoul his school and university on the way. Commercialism required a uniform length of 80,000 words. One distinguished novelist, when asked to conclude his serial story, replied, "I have a wife and family, and I never intend to conclude." Material success was the modernist's god. The old writers took a high view of their calling. Stevenson, Meredith, Henry James, whose friendship he treasured, did not care who produced a good novel, so long as a good novel was produced. He concluded by bidding God-speed to the new school of writers.

A speech of rare sensibility and charm delivered in his own inimitable way.

Mr. A. L. ATTWATER (Pembroke) confessed that the last appearance he had made in the House was to speak against the German menace in 1914. Though this motion was prophetic, he was nothing daunted. If modern workmanship showed a lack of construction and faulty technique, surely the reason was found in the fact that writers had devoted five years to war. There were three main criticisms of the modern novel. It was propagandist, too realistic, and delighted in psychological analysis. The first two criticisms were true, but as preaching played a large part in life, it was little wonder to find it appearing in literature. The social Mount of Olives was still a living volcano. Realism was a healthy attempt to strip life of all but the reality, and was a reaction against the purple tinsel of sentimentality. Psychological analysis was in harmony with the age. The discovery of human personality was the aim of the novelist, and that study demanded minute introspection. Art was experimental, and always tried to express herself in some new form. Art was like the alchemist searching for gold.

There also spoke :—*For*—Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel), Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke), Mr. R. H. L. Slater (Emmanuel), Mr. D. Morris (Christ's), Mr. C. C.

Marlow (St. John's), Mr. G. A. Newgass (Trinity), Mr. C. L. Bennet (Jesus).

*Against*—Mr. B. K. Martin (Magdalene), Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's), Mr. G. G. Sharp (Fitzwilliam Hall), Mr. F. W. Paish (Trinity), Mr. R. E. Watson (St. Catharine's), Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's), Mr. J. Herman (Fitzwilliam Hall).

Division :—Ayes, 123 ; Noes, 178. Majority Against, 55.

## EIGHTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, MARCH 9th, 1920.

### VISITORS' DEBATE.

Motion : "*That this House desires to express its renewed confidence in the Coalition Government.*"

The last debate of the term is always preceded by the declaration of the result of the poll. This was as follows :—

*President* : Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel).

*Vice-President* : Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse).

*Secretary* : Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's).

*Committee* : Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke).

Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel).

Mr. G. G. Sharp (Fitzwilliam Hall).

Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall).

Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's).

Mr. A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's).

The retiring President called upon the newly-elected officers to take their places, and then descended to the floor of the House, feeling like a warrior returning home after the battle. The new Secretary, Mr. E. H. F. Morris, proposed a vote of thanks to the retiring officers, and turned his fierce glare upon the chair and blackened every blot. Mr. Grose Hodge, the senior member of the new committee, seconded the vote of thanks. The retiring President, Mr. Shakespeare, replied. He thanked the House for the privilege of being allowed to guide the destinies of the Society through such a memorable term, and referred to the outside interest taken in the debates. Within 5 days of the Irish debate he had received two letters. One stated :—

"The debate at your Union (laughter) on Ireland proves that your young men have humour and ability. It also proves that they know as much about politics as a dog does about the moon."

The other said :—

“The debate on Ireland, over which you presided, was very interesting as coming from the embryo statesmen of Great Britain.”

The Irish are nothing if not humorous !

Mr. G. H. SHAKESPEARE, Emmanuel (retiring President) then proposed the motion. He touched lightly on the Peace Treaty. Considering that this was a settlement between about ten nations imbued by hereditary hatreds, he was surprised, not that the principles of Liberalism had been sometimes violated, but that they had been violated so seldom. This was due to our Prime Minister. The greatest event in home politics was the return to Parliament of Mr. Asquith. Every party was delighted. But this was no vindication of Liberalism, but a personal triumph. He denied that Liberals had taken out a copyright for principle. The Coalition relied on the tempering of justice with common sense. To-day there were only two parties, Labour and non-Labour. On main issues, like nationalisation and a capital levy, Asquithians had a similar policy to the Coalition. There was no room for a party Brontosaurus lurking about the lobby, extinct but refusing to die ! The other alternative was Labour, whose policy had a touch of the dawn about it. “When we are young,” he said, “we all read Swinburne and are half in love with Labour, but ‘when we are old, are old, and full of sleep,’ we wrap our souls in a dressing gown, read Matthew Arnold, drink port, and become Conservative.” But until Labour put off the robe of the tyrant and adopted constitutional methods, it would not make converts. In conclusion, he made a summary of what Coalition had done. Government was not run on a press-the-button system. Houses were not like mushrooms of one night’s growth. The Coalition welcomed the criticism and relied on the goodwill of all reasonable men and women.

Col. J. C. WEDGEWOOD, D.S.O., M.P. for Newcastle-under-Lyme, gave some time to the Government’s foreign policy. For their Russian policy the Coalition was at the mercy of Churchill and Clemenceau. This gave Russia a chance of producing a second Napoleon and bathing Europe in blood for fifty years. After wasting 120 millions on the internal affairs of Russia, they were forced to follow the previous advice of the Labour Party and come to terms. The result of the



Peace Treaty in Central Europe was seen in the dying struggles of civilisation. The towns were being depleted, because people in the country found that they could do without manufactures. Disease was rife everywhere, and the mortality was terrible. At home we found high prices, due to the Government's policy of inflating the currency and causing a glut of paper money. Labour stood for sound finance, economy in the Navy and Army, and the abolition of superfluous Government departments. The Coalition was content to carry on from day to day, guided by expediency and lacking in conviction. In conclusion, by a brilliant adaptation from Tolstoy, he compared the workers to cattle shut in from the rich pastures outside. He had learnt at school that it was "better to be dead than a slave, and only cowards submitted to injustice whether to themselves or other people."

Colonel Wedgewood succeeded in creating quite a tense atmosphere by his sincerity and eloquence. His Tolstoy simile was a fine piece of artistic imagery.

Mr. J. FITZALAN HOPE, M.P. for Sheffield, Central (Financial Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions), deputised for Mr. C.A. McCurdy, M.P. He admitted that the Government, as the residuary legatee of Armageddon, was unpopular in some quarters. Why not? Surely that testified to its moral courage. After criticising the action of Mr. Keynes, he dwelt on the Russian policy. Russia was ruled by the men who, in 1917, ruined their country and betrayed the Allies. If there was any talk of honour, we were bound to support after the war those with Denikin and Kolchak, who alone had been true to the Allies. It was surely dishonourable to throw them over in the hour of our victory. The state of Europe was not due to any Peace Treaty. If some terms of the latter were excessively severe they would be modified by the Reparation Commission. As to Home affairs, we should be able to make both ends meet. Labour fancied that, when war ended, the liabilities of war ended too. The inflation of currency was a war necessity. Anyhow, Labour, pledged to Nationalisation, could not talk of economy. The only alternative to the present Coalition was a new Coalition. The absence of one in America, not the presence of one here, had caused all the trouble in Europe. He saw no lack of principle in trying to steer the ship of State through the troubled waters. He was

proud of their aims and achievements. From being a bitter opponent of Mr. Lloyd George he had become his sincere admirer. "Ephemeral scribblers might condemn, but history would write their praise."

Mr. S. COPE MORGAN (Trinity) congratulated the aye-speakers on apologising for the Coalition. This had been useful, but had now completed its mission and should be decently buried. The war problems, to solve which it had been elected, were over, and we were faced with political issues. Who was not ashamed of the miserable 1918 election pledges? The body of the Coalition was a lumping thing, only kept together by a living head. The Prime Minister's supporters were either wolves in sheep's clothing or "any-raft-in-a-storm" politicians. The Government had no authority to constitute itself an anti-labour party. That simply put a grouse in the hands of Labour, who "loved grouse, feathers and all." Mr. Lloyd George had a star, but it was set. Coalition had no policy, and was "patched like a darned old sock."

Division :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 196. Motion therefore lost by 18 votes.

### Criticisms.

ABRAHAM, L. A. (Secretary, Peterhouse) Probably the most effective debater at the Union. He is fully informed about any subject, and puts his arguments in an arresting form. On Irish questions he is our "Devlin."

BARNES, J. H. (St. John's), is an idealist, whether supporting the League of Nations or beauty in art. He has a gift of elocution. Perhaps he takes the debate too seriously, but then he is an idealist.

BENNET, C. L. (Jesus), has made several really interesting speeches this term. He has a fund of knowledge. With greater variation in tone and pitch of voice would be still more effective.

BEST, C. P. (Sidney Sussex) An old Union hand who can argue clearly and with force. He has the courage of his conservatism.

BOWMAN, C. B. (Sidney Sussex). Only broke the silence once. A nice manner of speaking and a power of expression.

- BRIERLEY, A. E. (Peterhouse) Once he gets away from his notes can speak well and clearly.
- BURBURY, A. V. (King's) Has an entirely original style of speaking (or is it thinking aloud?) His delivery is apt to be monotonous, but his matter is always strong and his criticism worth having.
- DAVISON, E. L. (St. John's) Only spoke once during the term, but made quite a reputation. He is clear and interesting, and pleasantly critical. He is so wrapt up in what he says that he forgets that he is saying anything and becomes peripatetic. On one occasion he strayed five yards from the desk.
- DOBB, M. H. (Pembroke) Shows much promise as a debater, and should go far. More levity would strengthen the seriousness of his argument. But he is one of the clearest thinkers and speakers in the House.
- DONNELL, Sub-Lieut. R. H. (Trinity) Has rather too much levity, and he can be most flippant; but he is quite amusing and is not afraid even of an ex-Lord Chancellor. Should try a little more argument.
- FIELD, D. T. C. (Emmanuel) On his day can debate as effectively as anyone, but varies somewhat. Rather the bull-dog variety, and nicely tenacious. Scents a flaw in an opponent's logic with great skill.
- GEMMELL, J. A. (Emmanuel) Is a conscious or unconscious Scotch humorist—it is difficult to decide which. He is most amusing, and can argue well.
- GRIFFITHS, P. J. (Peterhouse) Soon gets up speed and talks so rapidly that one is apt to miss one point in running after the next. A very clear thinker though, and when he slows down, carries much weight.
- GROSE HODGE, G. G. (Pembroke) Believes that the only way to learn to speak is to keep at it. Debating is in his blood, his father and brother both being ex-presidents. One of our easiest speakers, who argues soundly on any wicket. He has livened up a lot.
- HENDERSON, A. (Trinity Hall) Like Atlas, bears a world of Labour on his shoulders, and he can do it too! Slightly hesitating in delivery and lacking somewhat in forcible emphasis. Still, he debates well, and puts up a really good case. With more practice will be a most effective speaker.

- HERMAN, J. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Rises late, full of zeal and enthusiasm, and argues well. Though apt to be prosaic and lengthy, always contributes something.
- JOHNSTON, W. D. (Christ's) If he spoke more would earn quite a reputation, but apparently he doesn't want to, or perhaps he cannot afford the time. Quite one of the best of the infrequent speakers.
- LAWLEY, F. E. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Is the Cleon of the Union. Strong, forcible, and effective. Too effective, almost to the point of being aggressive. Would learn much if he learnt to be moderate.
- LE MAITRE, A. S. (St. John's) Does not speak as well as he writes, but then that would be difficult. Most speakers fear our *Granta* correspondent until they know him better and realise that he is harmless. He speaks well when he conquers his nervousness, which he finds difficult to do, though some degree of nervousness is admittedly essential to a good speaker.
- MCCOY, Sub-Lieut. J. A. Never takes much part, but with practice would be quite good.
- IAN MACPHERSON (Trinity) Only spoke once, but has such a nice personality that if he took the Union more seriously he would soon be a star. A delightful style too.
- MORGAN, S. C. (Trinity) Is a most accomplished speaker. His faithfulness to Asquithianism is almost dog-like. He can be both logical and playful—both with deadly effect. His gags and tags are a perfect treat.
- MORRIS, E. H. F. (Christ's) Is a fine elocutionist. He has a sound knowledge of politics and economics and loves debating some quaint theory of his own invention. He takes his opinions so seriously that it is quite dangerous to interrupt him.
- MOUNTBATTEN, Sub-Lieut. Lord Louis (Christ's) Is an exponent of terse naval English. A gift of slang too. He can be most effective at confuting an opponent out of his own mouth. He had a difficult task in attacking Labour, because (rumour has it) his sympathies ran strongly that way.
- PAISH, F. W. (Trinity) Can always be relied on to argue a case in a concise and convincing manner. Has plenty of confidence and speaks like one long practised in the art.

- RAM, V. S. (Emmanuel) Is the best of the Indian speakers.
- RICHARDSON, J. H. (Emmanuel) Thinks concisely and deeply, and expresses himself as well as anyone in the Union. His knowledge of economics stands him in good stead, too.
- ROOM, L. E. (Corpus) Turns on the switch whenever the debate grows dark, and cheers everyone up. A most original speaker.
- SAMPSON, E. W. (Downing) Has taught himself to speak in one term, by pegging away at it. He improves every time he tries, and is both sincere and reasonable.
- SHARP, G. G. (Fitzwilliam Hall) Is an old Union expert. If any criticism is necessary, a little more humour would give more variation. Few members have such a complex knowledge of their subject or speak with greater persuasiveness.
- SNOWMAN, L. V. (Downing) Is always pleasant to follow, and tempers his speeches with levity and brevity.
- STRONG, P. N. W. (Selwyn) Makes up for what he lacks in argument by his refreshing manner of being seriously ridiculous. The effect would be greater if he prepared less.
- SWAN, T. (Emmanuel) Only spoke once, but made quite an impression with his whimsical intriguing style.
- THEOBALD, G. W. (Emmanuel) Is both eloquent and impressive. One of the most polished speakers in the House. Never at a loss for a happy phrase or an argument.
- WALKER, E. R. C. (Emmanuel) A canny Scot with a real sense of humour. A trifle slow, but always sure to say something worth saying.
- WATSON, R. E. (St. Catharine's) Is a most ready speaker, and should do well. At present he doesn't get quite enough light and shade, and suffers from being over emphatic perhaps. Beyond this he deserves nothing but praise.

The following only spoke once, and so briefly that it is difficult to foretell their summer by one swallow:—  
 E. H. Denyer (Selwyn), G. M. Grahame (King's), M. U. S. Jung (Christ's), C. C. Marlowe (St. John's), B. K. Martin (Magdalene), D. Morris (Christ's), G. A. Newgass (Trinity), G. G. Phillips (Trinity), H. V. A. Raikes (Trinity), R. H. L. Slater (Emmanuel), Major D. H. Steers (St. John's).



## Easter Term, 1920.

*President* : Mr. D. M. Reid (Emmanuel).

*Vice-President* : Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse).

*Secretary* : Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's).

*Committee* : Mr. G. G. Grose Hodge (Pembroke).

Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel).

Mr. G. G. Sharp (Fitzwilliam Hall).

Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall).

Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's).

Mr A. S. Le Maitre (St. John's).

The Easter Term saw the continuing rise of political parties with all the necessary intrigues in debate, in press, in societies and in cabals. The Liberal Club had been the first to use its influence in the Union, followed by those of the Labour and the Tory persuasions in quick succession. Each soon became suspicious of its neighbours, but the full blast of rivalry has yet to come. The spirit of the war had not yet died away, and there still remained the tendency to unite, when talking of government. But the delight of agitating the political wires was too great to be foregone, and finally, we saw, as of old, undergraduate politics a complete model of those at St. Stephen's: pseudo-whips, compliant newspaper editors, plot and counterplot—and all so seriously.

It was the policy during the term to allow opportunities of speaking to the greatest number of members. This bore good fruit. Perhaps some members feel sometimes that they should have been among the first four speakers. Little do they know the difficulties of arrangement, of the hurried journeys to and fro, of the frequent telephone messages and telegrams which only too often do not result in producing a speaker. It would gladden any President's heart to be met by an unprincipled scoundrel who would say : "Yes, I will speak when, where, and how you like . . . my name is So-and-So, and my college is. . . ." The President would naturally desire to have heard him speak, and might be a little startled at first, but his heart would warm soon enough. Above all, the honourable and obliging member should write his name-

down on a large piece of paper, as President's memories are liable to be defective.

One last word must be added, and this refers to a small, but at the same time distinctive change in the appearance of the Society in debate. During the last decade, the custom of wearing a severe black waistcoat with a white tie and tails has faded away, to be replaced by the more extravagant and handsome white waistcoat. "Tempora mutantur" may be true in only a small degree in the Union, but at last the change seems to have approached.

Too much cannot be said in praise of Dr. J. E. McTaggart, the retiring Treasurer, for the singular ability he has shown in raising the Society's finances from their former precarious to their present handsome position.

Finally, all the officers of the Union must agree that the smoothly working of everything in the Society is due to the devotion and hard work of Mr. Stanley Brown, the Chief Clerk, who works quietly in the background, but whose influence is enormous.

#### FIRST DEBATE, TUESDAY, APRIL 27th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House would welcome the resumption of friendly relations with Germany.*"

This was perhaps rather an alarming subject to introduce so soon after a war, but it provided a keen and serious debate. It showed a lack of bitterness which would have been surprising in any other country, and the subject was discussed frankly and on its merits. Many of the speakers on both sides had themselves had painful experiences in Germany.

Mr. G. W. THEOBALD, in introducing the motion, insisted that Englishmen should be above the level of personal animosity. The great majority of German people went into the war honestly and from motives of self-defence. He proposed immediate resumption of commercial relations, a fixed indemnity, and the immediate admission of Germany into the League of Nations. The alternatives were a resumption of militarism or a Bolshevik friendship between Russia and Germany. He gave the examples of South Africa and Ireland as extremes. Above all, he desired to give Germany a fair chance.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE, in opposing the motion, regretted to see that England had forgotten. The Germans were unrepentant and determined on revenge. Friendship with both France and Germany was impossible. Should England desert France? The Kaiser yet remained a great power for evil, and the German nation yet looked to him. Of the two policies, one spoke for strengthening the peace, the other for breaking up the British Empire.

Mr. M. H. DOBB : As a moderate, he seemed to be upholding the enemy. This was a natural but mistaken error. He stood for the proper resulting peace of a war to end wars. The wise policy was to make friendship with Germany and to strengthen the hands of the Republic against the militarists. A generous spirit of co-operation would heal the wounds and make a new Empire.

Mr. R. E. WATSON : In the revolution of October, 1918, the Germans knew they were beaten and did the wisest thing. Hindenburg and Ludendorff were still the great powers of Germany. He deplored the insidious campaign of impartiality. All parties in England were weak on the German question except the Tories.

Mr. P. N. W. STRONG admitted all the atrocities and abhorred them, but considered Germany to be already punished and now thoroughly repentant. It was for the benefit of all that Germany should recover, produce, and lower the food prices of Europe.

Mr. W. K. CARTER had had experience in the Army on the Rhine. The German was repentant when under control, but it was not a real repentance. He would insist on carrying out the Peace Treaty.

Mr. A. V. BURBURY disclaimed any suggestion of his being a pro-German. He could shock the House with his own experiences in a German Prison Camp. But similar horrors had happened in British Camps. England should adopt and assimilate the points that Germany had to offer.

Mr. D. T. C. FIELD did not agree that there were only two alternatives. There was another choice, and that was justice. He did not desire to crush Germany, but to be just.

Mr. K. GAUBA : Europe was on the road to ruin and economic chaos, but yet the old economic policy was still upheld. Germany should be admitted to the League at once.

Mr. T. B. JAMESON had started with an open mind, but was now convinced that Germany was entirely unrepentant. He insisted on fairness to France.

Mr. A. HENDERSON said that Germany's guilt had been overdone. President Wilson definitely said that he wished for no reprisal on the German people. France and Belgium had agreed with him. We ought to adopt a friendly policy, and not one that would turn Germany to Bolshevism.

Mr. A. E. BRIERLEY : Germany as a whole was aware of the ideals of the League of Nations, and believed in them.

Mr. A. B. COBBAN emphasised the importance of considering France. France had always turned to Britain, which should now support her.

Mr. G. TURBERVILLE sought to clean his own stable before cleaning those of others. Britain must first destroy her own militarism.

Mr. R. F. ADGIE : England needed much that Germany could give.

Mr. G. W. THEOBALD, the proposer, replied, and the House divided :—

Ayes, 122 ; Noes, 75. Majority for the motion, 47.

## SECOND DEBATE, TUESDAY, MAY 4<sup>th</sup>, 1920.

Motion : "*That unrestricted freedom of speech is essential to the best interests of this country.*"

This debate came as a result of certain occurrences which had taken place lately in Cambridge, but though it started in a staid manner, side issues soon appeared. Party feelings became aroused, in which, apparently, the Tory Party opposed free speech, while Liberals and Labour combined to defend it.

Arguments became furious, and approached the province of mere mud-throwing, but this ensured a vigorous and lively debate. The number of speakers was great, and many new speakers spoke for the first time.

Mr. G. G. SHARP started the debate by stating the issue and removing possibilities of side tracks. The motion did not intend to give free license to treason, sedition and blasphemy. Freedom of speech lay at the root of British liberties. Hence the comparatively peaceful internal history of England. Obstructions to free speech produce internal turmoil. Russia was an example of this. Ireland

was an example nearer to us, and here was a country of atrocity and turmoil. When new thoughts exist and spread abroad, daylight is always their best remedy, whether for their improvement and use, or for their destruction.

Mr. A. V. BURBURY also wished to keep the issue on the straight path, and to discuss that particular free speech that is used to sway the masses. This, in the majority of cases, was produced by the Press. Evil journals, ruled by diabolical editors, could do infinite harm. The *Daily Herald* had great uses perhaps, but it had a lamentably great following. The Press Bureau had done great work, and should be continued. The motion was on the question of the way in which freedom of speech affected the interests of the State, as a whole. The disturbances of last term could be reduced to a question of utility.

Mr. J. A. GEMMELL opened in quiet good humour, and roused the house to considerable merriment as he proceeded. Suppression of speech brings suppression of clear thought in its train, with a resulting sluggishness in the brains of the country. Mount Vesuvius overwhelmed villages; even so free speech overwhelmed the wealthy houses of the Conservative magnates. He discussed Rome, the Mediæval Church, Spain and Spaniards, and divers other interesting phenomena, and ended by saying that he understood, though only from hearsay, that in domestic affairs freedom of speech was essential.

Mr. D. T. C. FIELD, as an ardent supporter of law and order, insisted that revolutionary speeches advocating force and strife must be met by force and suppressed. Pure freedom of speech in Ireland only increased the trouble there. There should be moderation in all things. The great propaganda in America to raise hatred against England should be stopped, as should also the similar propaganda in *John Bull*. The danger in Cambridge last term was that the presence of Mr. Norman Angell in Cambridge was certain to produce trouble. The vast majority of the population was inarticulate, and ragging and rioting were their only means of immediate expression.

Mr. E. L. DAVISON: Legislation, always at work, could progress but slowly, and could do no more than it was then doing. Legislation could no more suppress free speech than it could suppress Norman Angell.



Mr. A. S. LE MAITRE saw much abuse of free speech. There was no harm in free discussion. But when a member of the University had had his head shaved it was done as righteous punishment. It happened because that gentleman sat down in Chapel during the National Anthem. Public opinion did the right thing.

Mr. V. S. RAM : Constitutional government in England had been successful because of freedom of speech. Sedition meant only disagreement with the party in power.

Mr. L. DE G. SIEVEKING thought that there could be no freedom of speech on account of moral laws.

Mr. R. NORTHAM : As all men have a right to their opinions, so they have a right to state their point of view.

Mr. E. H. F. MORRIS (Secretary) rose to bring the House to a sense of the fitness of things. Children were smacked for expressing their opinions, and rightly so. Restriction of speech was not directed solely against Labour.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Vice-President), on rising, spoke hardly a dozen words before a series of interruptions took place. Cool and collected, he parried and thrust to the increasing discomfort of his adversaries. He welcomed the first speech from the new Tory Leader in the House. (Instant interruption.) In his private capacity, the Secretary (point of order from the Secretary) . . . would restrict Labour (sensation). It savoured of conceit. . . . (Interruption by Mr. Burbury.) The opposition . . . (point of order from Mr. Le Maitre) were the Tory Party. (Prolonged wrangle between the two office-holders.) The speech was ended by a ruling from the President.

Mr. R. B. BRAITHWAITE spoke against the motion with great violence.

Mr. D. MORRIS could not understand where to draw the line.

Mr. L. E. ROOM defended the Tory party.

Here the debate wandered still more from the motion as it progressed to the end.

Mr. W. A. HARRIS supported Labour.

Mr. H. V. A. RAIKES wept over the Tory obsequies.

Mr. P. N. W. STRONG : Suppression produced constant underground rumblings.

Mr. R. E. WATSON was another who defended the Tory party, while

Mr. R. B. MEGLAUGHLIN defended Ulster.

Mr. J. DUFFILL said that both lunatic asylums and policemen curb violence.

Mr. R. F. ADGIE discussed "De Heretico Comburendo."

Mr. G. P. HOOLE : The objection to a heretic was not that he preached doctrines, but that he held them.

Mr. H. L. WILSON : Mr. Norman Angell, holding advanced views, should have been allowed to speak, and then could have been questioned.

Mr. R. W. MARSH deplored the presence of Sinn Fein agitators in Glasgow.

Mr. H. WILSON : Education is always increasing.

The Hon. Proposer, having replied, the House divided : Ayes, 97 ; Noes, 84. Majority for the motion, 13.

### THIRD DEBATE, TUESDAY, MAY 11th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House condemns the Foreign Policy of the present Government.*"

After the fiercely contested second debate of the term it was only natural that a certain warmth should be the result of the newly awakened political excitement. The presence of a visitor fortunately did not prevent or curtail the number of open speeches, and the debate was a good one.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Vice-President) welcomed the distinguished Member of Parliament to the Union Society. He felt convinced that the Foreign Policy of the Government was a wrong one, and the most important example of this was the Peace Treaty. Nothing could atone for Germany's crime of 1914. But it was a practical question. Germany should pay as much as possible. The treaty of Bulgaria was a flat contradiction of any principle of self-determination. Austria must have coal to start her industries. The Government had incurred the responsibility of Armenia, and had done nothing. The telegram to Marshal Pilsudski was a terrible mistake. The Government had produced the impolitic and unrighteous policy of a guilty administration.

Mr. I. MACPHERSON recognised the views of Mr. Keynes in the words of the Hon. Proposer. It was on the other hand, by a policy of masterly inactivity, that the British Government had produced so peaceful a Europe even as that at present. The present Government had at least

carried through the proposals for a League of Nations. British prestige stood higher now than that of any other country, and the settling down of Europe was due to the British Government.

Lieut.-Commander the Hon. J. M. KENWORTHY, R.N., M.P. for Hull, Central, found difficulty in discovering any Foreign Policy at all in that of the Government. But such as it was, it had swung from side to side, creating friction, laying the seeds of future trouble and settling nothing. The trade of Germany must first be started before she could pay the indemnity. She now lay beaten and crushed. With regard to Russia, he held the view that a Communist state could exist happily and be no menace to a Capitalist state. Britain now controlled one quarter of the earth's surface, and apparently for the interests of Britain only. He made a bitter attack on the cessions to Greece, the petty traders of the Levant, who would have fought against us but for the guns of the British Fleet at Athens. The Opposer had said that time would solve these difficulties. That was possible. Most of the children under 4 years in Austria were dead.

Mr. E. H. F. MORRIS (Secretary) was glad of the opportunity of hearing and opposing so redoubtable an opponent as the Member for Central Hull. The country had fought for five years for this peace. It must not be thrown away by an inflexible rigidity. The Government's Foreign Policy must necessarily be flexible. Bolshevism was the enemy of Russia itself. The British Government, by watching events, and by its later overtures to the Co-operative Societies in Russia, had followed the only wise policy.

Mr. V. W. W. S. PURCELL : The Government's attitude towards Poland was derogatory in the extreme. With the one hand Britain waved to Poland, with the other it welcomed Russia.

Mr. L. E. ROOM upheld Britain's attitude to Poland.

Mr. G. G. SHARP bewailed the utter insincerity of the Government. Peace was essential, and every nation had the right to decide its own form of government. The Government encouraged aggression by giving its moral support.

Mr. W. K. CARTER : When this country had extracted reparation, then only could it be blamed for the deaths of children.

Mr. K. GAUBA : The desires of the new subjects of the Empire had not been asked. They were apparently ignored.

Mr. S. V. T. ADAMS said that every Government laboured under difficulties.

Mr. J. H. BARNES : Diplomacy and selfishness covered everything.

Mr. C. M. HAINES : Those who were responsible for the war should make reparation.

Mr. C. L. BENNETT did not fear to be called a Pacifist, because by being that he was a true patriot.

Mr. R. W. GURNEY suggested a compromise.

The HON. PROPOSER waived his right of reply in favour of Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy. The House then divided. There appeared :—Ayes, 115 ; Noes, 87. Majority for the motion, 28.

#### FOURTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, MAY 18th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House should welcome the admission of Women to all privileges of this University in full equality with men.*"

This debate was a short one, and was but a preliminary to a most momentous ceremony in the annals of the Society, which took place after the conclusion of the debate. A description of the latter is given below after the last debate of the term.

As there were no visitors present, and admittance to the house could be secured by ticket only, a crowded but orderly house took part in this discussion of the rights of the fairer sex. The participation of a number of members of the Syndicate appointed by the Senate, who had previously considered the problem officially, added greatly to the debate.

Mr. J. T. SHEPPARD (ex-President) opened the debate in characteristic vein. He had always been in favour of women suffrage, but had not expected it to come in his time. Now he was faced with the admission of women to the University, and faced it with resolute courage. He discussed the two reports of the Syndicate appointed by the Senate, and supported the report that favoured separate colleges for men and women. The admission to

Matriculation and to Degrees must follow, and later, necessarily, membership of the Senate. The honours and posts in the University should be open to the best candidates, regardless of sex.

Mr. P. L. BABINGTON took the question very seriously. After the charming eloquence and delightful suggestion of Mr. Sheppard, he wished to bring the house to the realisation of the horrors involved. Co-education was not yet a demonstrated success. The effect of co-education would be the end of all that is cherished in University life to-day.

Mr. E. L. DAVISON: Co-education could be evaded no longer. Woman had earned her righteous reward, and must be taken seriously. She must pass from her position as an amateur to that of a professional. Her competition would not endanger man's prestige.

Mr. J. H. BARNES examined the suggested schemes, and found all impossible. He did not pretend to stand on a pinnacle in his masculinity, but retained his old opinions. The sexes are complementary and their functions collateral.

Mr. J. R. M. BUTLER (ex-President) supported the motion on grounds of expediency. The facts should be faced. The University was now co-educational in actual fact, whatever it might pretend to be.

Mr. G. W. THEOBALD is an authority on nursery rhymes, but he would abolish Newnham and Girton with glee and gusto. The women's colleges create nothing but disturbance in an otherwise calm and studious University.

Mr. A. V. BURBURY felt soothed and softened by the refining influence of the women's colleges. He desired more co-operation and a removal of artificial barriers.

Mr. J. F. A. NORTH opposed the motion, but retained his admiration for the fairer sex. He desired to keep woman on her pedestal.

Mr. A. HENDERSON, on account of the surplus of women, desired to secure a remedy.

Mr. C. L. WISEMAN (ex-Secretary) depicted the horrors of the teaching profession, and desired to save women from it.

Mr. A. D. McNAIR (ex-President) saw that women were now compelled to earn their own livings, and should therefore have full advantages for so doing.

Mr. F. E. H. BOSTOCK deplored the motion as being unjust to the male protectors of womenkind.



Mr. S. COPE MORGAN welcomed women to Parliament and to the Bar, and desired everything for their better advantage.

The Hon. Proposer having replied, the House divided : Ayes, 365 ; Noes, 266. Majority for the motion, 99.

#### FIFTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, MAY 25th, 1920.

Motion : "*That, in the opinion of this House, Co-Partnership would provide a better solution for the present industrial unrest than Nationalisation.*"

This debate took place on a hot summer evening, and the temperature of the sentiments expressed in the arguments seemed almost to rival the temperature of the air. Not once or twice only did passion get the better of reason. The first four speeches were long, but the interruptions made them exciting. A heavy piston head running white hot can only do itself harm. Even so do ebullitions of temper damage the causes of the furious.

Perhaps certain ultra-socialistic views rather startled the conservative minds of some members. But as these views exist very strongly among the masses of the country, it would be strange if they could not be discussed quietly in the House. Indeed, it was strange.

Mr. E. H. F. MORRIS (Secretary) rose to propose a motion which was a favourite subject of his own. There were only two proposed solutions for the present industrial unrest : Co-partnership and Nationalisation. No additional wealth can be accumulated from the existing wealth without the help of Labour. Labour desires to see the fruits of its toil. He suggested that every man should consider himself as capital. He is his own wealth. When he goes to work he should understand that he is investing his own wealth, that is himself, in the business. He should then be paid proportional and definite dividends or shares of the profit. Every man must have some responsibility for his own good. Co-partnership would supply this.

Mr. A. HENDERSON : The worker of to-day says, " My wage is this ; my cost of living is that ; I cannot live." The employer gives more wages and raises the cost of living correspondingly. The workers are realising their own importance to the community. Co-partnership will not reduce the cost of living nor will it stop profiteering.

Nationalisation means State ownership of industry with joint control by the consumers, managers and workers.

Mr. S. COPE MORGAN : The present vicious circle was intolerable : strikes ; rise of wages ; rise of prices. The class prejudice stirred up by the Labour Party, was at the bottom of the trouble. Nationalisation was not a principle, it was a disease. Productivity could never come without goodwill in industry. There must be a common basis of understanding. All the world is composed of snobs. Even the bedmakers of Trinity are snobs. Unless Labour ceases to preach class-feeling, it will never do good. Capital must be made to accept its due return and no more, but it must be allowed its right and honourable position in industry.

Rev. C. E. RAVEN attacked the systems propounded with such vigour as to produce constant interruptions. Prices would rise more than ever under a system of co-partnership. Co-partnership was a system made by well-meaning men of business who hated slavery of labour and who longed for a new spirit in industry. But the movement gave to the worker neither a true status in industry nor industrial success. Labour knew that co-partnership would undermine the minimum wage. It was simply a continuance of the same old competitive firms, sheer undiluted greed, and a continuance of the profits which they could get from the unfortunate consumers. Real nationalisation with the best ideals could save the country.

Mr. A. V. BURBURY cited Henry Ford as a man who had showed that profit-sharing could work.

Mr. T. G. N. HALDANE : The new spirit demanded nationalisation. The attitude of the owners was one insisting on complete control, a short-sighted policy.

Mr. G. R. D. SHAW had always been sceptical of vain chatter about brotherhood.

Mr. M. H. DOBB : Co-partnership would strengthen economic autocracy. Competition had ceased, and the present system was one of combination in industry.

Mr. G. G. SHARP, from the cross-benches, proposed nationalisation for some industries, co-partnership for others.

Mr. E. H. ROSEVEARE : Workers hate their work, so did he.

Mr. T. H. SEARLS : There was nothing in co-partnership to prevent the exploitation of the consumer.

Mr. W. K. CARTER : This country must control her monopolies.

Mr. V. W. S. PURCELL attacked any system which was not open and fair to the workers.

Mr. H. V. A. RAIKES : Material gain is the basis of all work.

Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Vice-President) attacked vigorously, but the Secretary, remembering the last debate, and being already exhausted, refused to bite at the flies thrown at him. He taunted the proposers of the motion with the land-song of the Liberals in the election of 1910. The spirit of Democracy was on the side of Labour, and so also was Time.

Mr. G. TURBERVILLE saw only trouble ahead in nationalisation.

Mr. J. H. RICHARDSON had great belief in the working-man and in the democracy of the country.

The SECRETARY having replied, the House divided :— Ayes, 92 ; Noes, 51. Majority for the motion, 41.

#### SIXTH DEBATE, TUESDAY, JUNE 1ST, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House would welcome the grant of Dominion Home Rule to India in the near future.*"

This debate took place in the most strenuous week of Tripos and Examination. For a controversial subject there was not so much heat as might have been expected. Mr. J. T. Sheppard (ex-President, King's College) took the chair in the middle of the debate, and was enabled to give a casting vote on the division, an unusual occurrence.

Mr. P. J. GRIFFITHS spoke of India's loyalty to the Empire during the war. She now claimed her reward. Two possible lines of argument were open to the Opposition, either that the British Empire was in danger, or that the civilisation of India was not sufficiently advanced for Home Rule. The safety of the Empire depended not on guns, but on solidarity and a spirit of loyalty.

Mr. P. N. W. STRONG said that the time was not yet ripe. In India 94 per cent. of the population were illiterate and entirely uneducated. India was not a nation. In comparison with India, the old Austrian Empire was a model of unity. He favoured the propositions of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, and desired evolution rather than revolution.

Mr. K. GAUBA, as an Indian, claimed to speak with more authority than an Englishman. India should have either a policy of complete repression or one of complete liberty. If India consisted of twelve separate nations, let them all have Home Rule. The deliberate policy of Great Britain had been to keep India divided. He wanted, above all, control of finance and the fiscal policy.

Mr. L. E. ROOM : The function of the British was to keep the balance between the various factions. The benefits of British Rule were forgotten amongst the lesser troubles. India lived in a time of unexampled prosperity.

Mr. B. H. ZAIDI acknowledged the debt of India to England. He complained that 50 per cent. of the Budget went to the Army.

Mr. J. R. SMITH had direct information about the riots at Amritsar, and of the unstable state of India.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSTON spoke of Democracy. If India could not govern itself, it was not the duty of England to govern her.

Mr. G. W. THEOBALD : Caste was a very real thing. Democratic government, with caste in operation, was impossible.

Mr. J. L. KAPUR : Indian civilisation would be happier without that of England.

Mr. T. A. BOLD defended General Dyer.

Mr. T. A. SINCLAIR cited the treatment of other Dominions by Britain, and claimed the same for India.

Mr. L. DE G. SIEVEKING : If the Pax Britannicum were removed from India, would the Indian members of the House go back there to live ?

Mr. K. M. KHADYE : High and low castes were now uniting to form an Indian nation.

Mr. S. V. T. ADAMS : Nationally speaking, India was yet a baby, and was too young for self-government.

Mr. E. L. DAVISON : Home Rule in India would strengthen the power of Britain.

Mr. A. S. LE MAITRE : England was giving all she could to India.

Mr. G. G. SHARP : Indians should control Finance and Education. India would be ripe for Government in ten years.

Mr. G. GOVINDARAJULU : India should not be granted Home Rule. She should rise up and take it.

Mr. C. L. BENNET spoke allegorically, and compared New Zealand.

Mr. L. G. HAYWOOD opposed the motion.

Mr. H. N. DAVY had been in India, and believed in Home Rule.

On a division there appeared :—Ayes, 82 ; Noes, 82. The Chairman gave his casting vote against the motion. Majority against the motion, 1.

#### CHANGE OF OFFICERS' DEBATE, TUESDAY, JUNE 8th, 1920.

Motion : "*That this House is of opinion that the time has come when an appeal should again be made to the electorate.*"

As has been the custom for generations, the final debate of a term revolves on the doings and misdoings of the Government in power. After the results of the poll for the election of officers for the ensuing year had been read, the new officers took their seats, and laudatory speeches were made. The poll was announced as follows :

*President* : Mr. L. A. Abraham (Peterhouse).

*Vice-President* : Mr. E. H. F. Morris (Christ's).

*Treasurer* : Mr. A. D. McNair (Gonville and Caius).

*Librarian* : Mr. B. G. Brown (Trinity).

*Steward* : Mr. S. C. Roberts (Pembroke).

*Secretary* : Mr. G. G. Shard (Fitzwilliam Hall).

*Standing Committee* : Mr. G. W. Theobald (Emmanuel).

Mr. A. Henderson (Trinity Hall).

Mr. A. V. Burbury (King's).

Mr. E. L. Davison (St. John's).

Mr. D. T. C. Field (Emmanuel).

Mr. M. H. Dobb (Pembroke).

The most striking feature of the debate was the moment in which the distinguished visitor, the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin, P.C., M.P., repudiated the accusation of expediency, and spoke his mind on the subject of true idealism, and how it exists in all good faith in the Government.

Mr. D. M. REID (retiring President) pointed out that the Government had taken advantage of the prevailing enthusiasm to rush through a General Election in 1918, with the cries : "Hang the Kaiser" and "Make Germany pay." He touched upon Ireland, and reminded the House of the parallel of the War of American Independence.



Time would show that the Government's policy was equally wrong in Ireland. Turning to finance, he had formerly been convinced that there was at any rate one honest man in the Government, Mr. Chamberlain. He regretted therefore that the Big Business Interests caused him to vacillate over Excess Profits Duty. Labour, on the whole, had given fair support to the Government. But the exceptions in the matter of shipping munitions to Poland and the case of Ireland could not be defended. Russia showed the lack of a policy in the Government's attitude. The League of Nations was practically dead, and the blame lay upon the shoulders of the Government. The country was now cool-headed. The time was ripe for another appeal to the people.

Mr. J. W. MORRIS (ex-President) : The Government was like a college kitchen ; it was always being criticised, but managed to pick up a bit in May Week. A mass of progressive legislation had been put through by the Government. Instances were to be found in health, transport and land. The Government had decided rightly that its first duty was to govern Ireland. The fruits of their policy could only be reaped by continuing to give the Government a fair chance to which their experience and ability entitled them. Considering the unparalleled crisis through which Britain had been, the state of British credit and prosperity was marvellous. He saw no alternative Government either in the Liberal or Labour parties. The only alternative was another coalition. At the present time the country needed not a general election, but a spirit of coalition and unity in the country.

Mr. C. R. FAY criticised the General Election of 1918. Its purpose was to give the Premier a majority in his pocket by using the prevailing enthusiasm. The Premier treated all his opponents as unpatriotic, and invited England to enter the path of crude violence. The new life of peace had been started with the lie that Germany would pay. Undoubtedly Labour, if returned to power, meant to nationalise the coal industry and the railways, but this did not mean an involved centralised bureaucracy. He appealed to the Government to stand aside and to let the supporters of Home Rule have a chance. Politics were changing, and new unrepresented classes were emerging. The Premier's policy meant an estrangement between classes for twenty years.

The Right Hon. STANLEY BALDWIN, P.C., M.P. for Worcestershire, Bewdley, did not see how the Premier, as an honest man, could have avoided holding a general election in 1918. The Franchise Act had enlarged the electorate, and the Parliament had been elected eight years before. The Peace Conference was imminent, and it was imperative that the Premier should go to it armed with the authority of the British people.

In his opinion the old party system was dead. There was no room for the old parties, but there was still room for a party representing the Conservative instincts of the country.

The Government had taken up many tasks. Education had produced Mr. Fisher's Act. He explained the difficulties in dealing with the Excess Profits Duty. It was impossible to capture the whole of the profits made out of the war, but no surer means could have been devised than the Income Tax, the Super Tax and the E.P.D.

The Labour Party was young and enthusiastic, but he would deeply regret it if politics became a contest of Labour v. the Rest. The propaganda of class warfare and hate filled him with depression. It brought death, not life. The spirit of love was what was needed, and would alone sustain them amid the dust and dirt of public life.

Mr. C. L. WISEMAN (ex-Secretary) had voted for Mr. Lloyd George because he had thought he was honest, and would not let himself become the tool of vested interests. He was now sadly disillusioned.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE said that if the present House of Commons was unrepresentative it was the fault not of the Government, but of the people who put them into power.

The House divided, and there appeared :—Ayes, 129 ; Noes, 135. Majority against the motion, 6.

## PRIVATE BUSINESS MEETING.

Honorary Membership of Viscount Jellicoe and  
Earl Haig.

TUESDAY, MAY 18th, 1920.

Soon after 10 p.m., the ceremony of conferring the Honorary Membership of the Society upon the two great leaders of the nation in war began. Into the House, with

members standing, amid deafening applause, the President led Viscount Jellicoe and Earl Haig, followed by Dr. Giles (Vice-Chancellor), Dr. J. E. McTaggart (Treasurer), Dr. J. N. Keynes (Registrar), Rev. G. A. Weekes (Master of Sidney Sussex), and Paymaster-Captain Weekes, R.N.

The President took the chair, and Mr. L. A. ABRAHAM (Vice-President) rose to move :

*"That Honorary Membership be conferred upon Admiral of the Fleet, Viscount Jellicoe, K.C.B., O.M., K.C.V.O."*

With his noted Irish eloquence, the Vice-President voiced the sentiments of all when he said that where great deeds are concerned we cannot speak of them, but we can always think of them. The Society wished to record its profound sense of admiration to the noble Viscount as a sailor, a commander, and as a man.

Mr. E. H. F. MORRIS (Secretary) rose to the occasion and seconded the motion in a confident manner.

Dr. J. E. McTAGGART (Treasurer) moved :

*"That Honorary Membership be conferred upon Field-Marshal Earl Haig, K.T., G.C.B., O.M., G.C.V.O., K.C.I.E."*

Though the Union Society is one where youth leads and takes precedence, yet the older members were still members, and he was glad to join the voices of the older members with those of the younger in welcoming the two great guests to the Union. He was especially glad that he, a Cliftonian, was able to welcome to the University and to the Society Earl Haig, the greatest of all Cliftonians.

Mr. G. G. GROSE HODGE seconded the motion in a happy speech. He claimed for the House the bond of common service with their great guest, in the course of which service he had learned to honour and revere him.

The President then put the two motions to the House, which signified its unanimous assent by members rising in their places.

Admiral of the Fleet, Viscount JELlicOE, amidst tremendous applause, thanked the House for its vote, and complimented it on its eloquence. He had been reading an article in which the British Officer had been described as lacking in intelligence. The chief quality in leadership is character. And nowhere is character so finely moulded as at the University. As long as the Universities last we should have no lack of men fitted to be leaders.

The House was delighted by the speech of Viscount Jellicoe, which was as well turned and eloquent, and at the same time as direct, as any model of oratory.

Field-Marshal Earl HAIG, who was greeted with prolonged and vociferous applause, thanked the House in the kindest way, addressing members as comrades and fellows. He sketched the state of the country before the war. When Lord Haldane went to the War Office a system was at last decided upon—an Expeditionary Force, designed for service on the continent, and a large Territorial Reserve. But war came before the scheme could bear fruit, and on the outbreak of war we were forced again to improvisation—where men who should have been leaders were allowed to fight and die as private soldiers. The object of education was to fit a man for citizenship. Citizenship connotes the duty to defend one's country—and will do so for many years. Each man must see that he is fitted to take his place in the defence of his country.

The newly-elected Honorary Members signed their names in the book of membership, and the House then adjourned.

After the officers and members of Committee had been introduced to the distinguished Honorary Members in the Committee Room, the latter passed through a lane of vociferous members who made the sleeping town of Cambridge re-echo with their cheers.

### Criticisms.

Senior Members of the University, Visitors and ex-Presidents have been omitted from this list.

ABRAHAM, L. A. (Peterhouse) Vigorous, well-informed, and brilliant in attack. A master of repartee. The Burke of the Union.

ADAMS, S. V. T. (King's) Original and considered.

ADGIE, R. F. (Clare) Possesses the lighter touch, and should speak more often.

BARNES, J. H. (St. John's) Is always interesting; works in his own way and is invariably clear.

BENNET, C. L. (Jesus) Has ideas, but should avoid being diffuse.

BRAITHWAITE, R. B. (King's) Could be very good if he spoke more.

- BURBURY, A. V. (King's) Ponderous in attack, but carries conviction.
- CARTER, W. K. (Sidney Sussex) With an improved delivery would be good.
- DAVISON, E. L. (St. John's) Possesses an artistic sense that is a welcome change.
- DOBB, M. H. (Pembroke) The best of the younger speakers. A good delivery and perfect English.
- FIELD, D. T. C. (Emmanuel) A refreshing Tory with a nautical flavour.
- GAUBA, K. (Downing) Reasoned and moderate. Good.
- GEMMELL, J. A. (Emmanuel) Witty and amusing.
- GRIFFITHS, P. J. (Peterhouse) With improved delivery will be good.
- GROSE HODGE, G. G. (Pembroke) A redoubtable opponent and an immovable Tory. Good in attack and defence.
- HALDANE, T. G. N. (Trinity) Will improve with more fire.
- HARRIS, W. A. (St. John's) Would make a powerful agitator.
- HENDERSON, A. (Trinity Hall) Very well informed. A good speaker.
- HOOLE, G. P. (Christ's) Knows his subject and should speak more often.
- LE MAITRE, A. S. (St. John's) Has improved a great deal. Sound and sometimes brilliant.
- MACPHERSON, I. (Trinity) Speaks with the hard common sense of his race.
- MORRIS, E. H. F. (Christ's) A master of tactics ; scintillates when opening attack ; fiery in repartee. Very good.
- NORTH, J. F. A. (Downing) An authority on the Press. Good.
- NORTHAM, R. (Queens') Well versed on trade topics. Interesting and forcible.
- PURCELL, V. W. W. S. (Trinity) Shows promise.
- RAIKES, H. V. A. (Trinity) Good in attack.
- RAM, V. S. (Emmanuel) Excitable, but interesting.
- RICHARDSON, J. H. (Emmanuel) Well versed in his subjects.
- ROOM, L. E. (Corpus) With more care will be useful.
- SEARLS, T. H. (Trinity Hall) Reasoned and honest. A good speaker.



- SHARP, G. G.** (Fitzwilliam Hall) Perhaps the fairest and least biassed of the Union speakers. Very well read, has an excellent style, and is never dull. Has a certain and assured future.
- SIEVEKING, L. de G.** (St. Catharine's) If he would take subjects more seriously might be good.
- STRONG, P. N. W.** (Selwyn) Witty and clever. Should practise speaking with fewer notes.
- THEOBALD, G. W.** (Emmanuel) Has ability and a pretty and light humour. Dangerous both in attack and defence, but always sincere.
- TURBERVILLE, G.** (Trinity) Original and amusing.
- WATSON, R. E.** (St. Catharine's) Takes considerable pains and makes a good speech.
- WILSON, H. L.** (Emmanuel) Shows originality and knowledge of his subject.

The following also spoke, but fair criticism based on one speech is impossible :—

- BOLD, T. A.** (Corpus)
- BOSTOCK, F. E. H.** (Queens')
- BRIERLEY, A. E.** (Peterhouse)
- COBBAN, A. B.** (Gonville and Caius)
- DAVY, H. N.** (King's)
- GOVINDARAJULU** (Magdalene)
- GURNEY, R. W.** (Trinity Hall)
- HAINES, C. M.** (Pembroke)
- HAYWOOD, L. G.** (Gonville and Caius)
- JAMESON, T. B.** (Queens')
- JOHNSTON, W. D.** (Christ's)
- KAPUR, J. L.** (Magdalene)
- MARSH, R. W.** (Trinity)
- MEGLAUGHLIN, R. B.** (Jesus)
- MORRIS, D.** (Christ's)
- ROSEVEARE, E. H.** (St. John's)
- SHAW, G. R. D.** (King's)
- SINCLAIR, T. A.** (St. John's)
- WILSON, H.** (Peterhouse)
- ZAIDI, B. H.** (Fitzwilliam Hall)

## Index of Names

- Abraham, L. A. 9, 12, 17, 21, 33,  
     38, 42, 43, 46, 52, 54, 56, 71,  
     74, 78, 83, 84, 90, 92, 95, 96  
 Adams, S. V. T. 86, 91, 96  
 Adgie, R. F. 11, 81, 84, 96  
 Albert, H.R.H. Prince 25, 27, 38,  
     55, 65  
 Allen, J. E. 37  
 Arundel, E. S. 25, 46  
 Attwater, A. L. 70  
 Aziz, Abdul 42, 47  
  
 Babington, P. L. 87  
 Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, M.P.  
     94  
 Barnes, J. H. 6, 7, 8, 18, 22, 23, 31,  
     43, 47, 52, 54, 69, 74, 86, 87, 96  
 Barran, H. V. F. 6, 35, 37, 47  
 Bennet, C. L. 64, 71, 74, 86, 92, 96  
 Berlyn, M. L. 33, 47  
 Best, C. P. 11, 12, 18, 22, 23, 25, 34  
     43, 47, 63, 74  
 Bidder, G. P. 37  
 Bold, T. A. 43, 47, 91, 98  
 Bostock, F. E. H. 87, 98  
 Bousfield, J. K. 11  
 Bowman, C. B. 64, 74  
 Braithwaite, R. B. 83, 96  
 Brierley, A. E. 58, 64, 75, 81, 98  
 Brown, B. G. 5, 7, 52, 92  
 Brown, Stanley. 44, 79  
 Buck, S. H. 11  
 Bullough, E. 5, 7, 52  
 Burbury, A. V. 33, 35, 42, 47, 56,  
     71, 75, 78, 80, 82, 87, 89, 92, 97  
 Butler, J. R. M. 29, 54, 87  
  
 Carroll, J. A. 16  
 Carter, W. K. 80, 85, 90, 97  
 Cecil, Lord Robert. 30  
 Charles, L. B. 5, 12  
 Churchill, Hon. Winston, M.P. 67  
 Clarke-Williams, A. E. 10  
 Cobban, A. B. 81, 98  
 Cole, G. D. H. 25  
 Condliffe, J. B. 8, 14, 18, 21, 23,  
     33, 35, 47  
 Coulton, G. G. 24, 62, 63  
  
 Dalton, Hugh. 5  
 David, I. 6, 7, 21  
  
 Davies, H. B. 5  
 Davison, E. L. 18, 25, 40, 47, 69,  
     75, 82, 87, 91, 92, 97  
 Davy, H. N. 92, 98  
 Denyer, E. H. 64, 77  
 Dobb, M. H. 42, 47, 59, 75, 80, 89,  
     92, 97  
 Donnell, R. H. 40, 47, 58, 62, 75  
 Duffill, J. 84  
 Dunning, N. G. 6, 18, 23, 34, 47  
  
 Edwards, E. E. 35, 47  
 Ellis, C. D. B. 5, 7, 11  
 Evans, Ernest. 6  
 Ezard, B. J. B. 33, 47  
  
 Fay, C. R. 8, 93  
 Field, D. T. C. 6, 8, 11, 18, 21, 33,  
     35, 37, 40, 48, 62, 75, 80, 82,  
     92, 97  
 Funnell, C. G. 42, 48  
  
 Gage-Hall, F. A. 25  
 Gallop, C. 66  
 Gauba, K. 80, 86, 91, 97  
 Gemmell, J. A. 64, 75, 82, 97  
 Giles, Peter, Vice-Chancellor. 95  
 Glover, T. R. 32  
 Govindarajulu, G. 91, 98  
 Graham, G. M. 9, 56, 77  
 Graham, W., M.P. 36  
 Grieg, Commander. 57  
 Griffiths, P. J. 35, 42, 48, 59, 75,  
     90, 97  
 Grose Hodge, G. G. 12, 18, 21, 23,  
     24, 35, 40, 43, 44, 48, 52, 56, 58,  
     70, 71, 75, 78, 80, 94, 95, 97  
 Grose Hodge, H. 10, 19  
 Gurney, R. W. 86, 98  
  
 Haig, Earl. 86, 98  
 Haines, C. M. 86, 98  
 Haywood, L. G. 92, 98  
 Haldane, Viscount. 61  
 Haldane, T. G. N. 89, 97  
 Harris, W. A. 83, 97  
 Harrison, G. B. 9  
 Heckstall-Smith, H. M. 33, 48  
 Henderson, A. 35, 37, 42, 43, 48,  
     52, 56, 57, 64, 71, 75, 78, 81, 87,  
     88, 92, 97

- Henderson, H. D. 54  
 Henry, H.R.H. Prince 25, 27, 38,  
     55, 57, 65  
 Herbert, E. 5, 10, 22  
 Herman, J. 25, 33, 35, 40, 48, 64,  
     71, 76  
 Hillson, N. H. 13  
 Hodges, Frank 15  
 Hoole, G. P. 84, 97  
 Hope, J. Fitzalan, M.P. 73  
 Horobin, I. M. 43, 48  
 Hoste, T. B. 15  
  
 Imam, S. S. 9, 22  
  
 Jameson, T. B. 81, 98  
 Jellicoe, Viscount 95, 96  
 Johnson, G. F. 5, 7  
 Johnston, W. D. 35, 48, 56, 76,  
     91, 98  
 Jones, G. L. 6, 9, 21  
 Jung, M. U. S. 56, 77  
  
 Kapur, J. L. 91, 98  
 Kenworthy, Commander J. M.,  
     M.P. 85  
 Keynes, J. N. 95  
 Khadye, K. M. 91  
  
 Lassen, E. J. 65  
 Lawley, F. E. 25, 37, 40, 48, 59, 76  
 Le Maitre, A. S. 6, 7, 11, 17, 18,  
     23, 32, 40, 43, 48, 56, 64, 71,  
     76, 78, 83, 91, 97  
 Lewis, T. A., M.P. 6  
  
 Macpherson, I. 43, 48, 53, 76, 84,  
     97  
 McCoy, J. A. 56, 76  
 McNair, A. D. 87, 92  
 McNair, W. L. 5, 7, 19  
 McTaggart, J. E. 5, 7, 52, 79, 95  
 Malone, Col., M.P. 14  
 Marlow, C. C. 71, 77  
 Marsh, R. W. 84, 98  
 Martin, B. K. 71, 77  
 Maskell, E. J. 18  
 Meglaughlin, R. B. 83, 98  
 Milne, J. P. 9, 13, 16, 18  
 Morgan, S. Cope 16, 22, 25, 28,  
     35, 49, 58, 62, 74, 76, 88, 89  
 Morris, D. 35, 49, 70, 77, 83, 98  
 Morris E. H. F. 25, 36, 40, 43, 49,  
     52, 59, 71, 76, 78, 83, 85, 88, 92,  
     95, 97  
 Morris, J. W. 7, 8, 16, 18, 23, 44,  
     56, 60, 93  
 Mounbatten, Lord Louis 35, 39,  
     43, 49, 52, 65, 76  
 Mozley, Rev. J. K. 5, 19  
  
 Newgass, G. A. 71, 77  
 Nihill, J. H. B. 6, 15, 45  
 Norman, Rev. W. H. 33  
 North, J. F. A. 9, 18, 25, 49, 87, 97  
 Northam, R. 42, 49, 83, 97  
 Northumberland, Duke of 29  
  
 Paish, F. W. 37, 42, 49, 56, 71, 76  
 Palmer, J. B. 62  
 Pattison-Muir, Rev. R. M. 5  
 Pedler, T. S. 33, 35, 49  
 Perraton, L. H. 13  
 Perry, R. W. 35, 49  
 Phillips, G. G. 35, 49, 56, 77  
 Prest, C. P. 33, 49  
 Pritchard, E. A. B. 42, 49  
 Pryke, W. W. 40, 49  
 Purcell, V. W. W. S. 33, 49, 85,  
     90, 97  
  
 Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur 69  
  
 Rahim, M. I. 25, 49  
 Raikes, H. V. A. 43, 50, 56, 77,  
     83, 90, 97  
 Ram, V. S. 42, 50, 56, 77, 83, 97  
 Ramage, C. B. 66  
 Ramsbottom, W. H. 37, 55  
 Raven, Rev. C. E. 89  
 Reddaway, W. F. 6  
 Reid, D. M. 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18,  
     23, 33, 38, 43, 52, 58, 66, 71,  
     78, 92  
 Richardson, J. H. 40, 50, 56, 59,  
     77, 90, 97  
 Roberts, S. C. 6, 45, 92  
 Room, L. E. 43, 50, 58, 77, 83,  
     85, 91, 97  
 Roseveare, E. H. 89, 98  
 Runciman, W. L. 40, 50  
 Russel, A. W. 25, 50  
  
 Sampson, E. W. 13, 35, 50, 54,  
     64, 77  
 Schofield, A. 6, 16  
 Searls, T. H. 89, 97  
 Sells, A. L. 25, 33, 50  
 Shakespeare, G. H. 11, 13, 17, 18,  
     23, 35, 41, 43, 52, 71, 72  
 Shard, G. G. 92  
 Sharp, G. G. 14, 21, 24, 35, 50,  
     57, 64, 71, 77, 78, 81, 85, 89,  
     91, 98  
 Shaw, G. R. D. 89, 98  
 Sheppard, J. T. 32, 86, 90  
 Sieveking, L. de G. 83, 91, 98  
 Sinclair, T. A. 91, 98  
 Slater, R. H. L. 70, 77  
 Smellie, K. 25, 50  
 Smillie, Robert 20

- Smith, F. E. 18  
Smith, J. R. 91  
Snowman, L. V. 54, 58, 64, 77  
Somerset, Raglan 6  
Steers, D. H. 40, 50, 64, 77  
Stevenson, B. F. 11  
Strong, P. N. W. 9, 16, 25, 34, 42,  
50, 55, 77, 80, 83, 90, 98  
Swan, T. 13, 33, 50, 53, 77
- Thakur, V. K. 9, 22  
Theobald, G. W. 33, 37, 40, 43,  
50, 52, 54, 63, 70, 71, 77, 78,  
79, 81, 87, 91, 92, 98  
Thompson, A. C. 6, 7, 8, 22, 41, 50  
Thompson, C. N. 7, 22  
Thornton, D. L. 40, 51  
Tracey, C. B. 33, 51  
Turberville, G. 81, 90, 98
- Walker, E. R. C. 18, 33, 51, 64, 77  
Warren, D. D. 35, 51  
Watson, R. E. 40, 43, 51, 55, 64,  
71, 77, 80, 83, 98  
Wedgewood, Col. J. C., M.P. 72  
Weekes, Paymaster Captain, R.N.  
95  
Weekes, Rev. G. A. 95  
Wild, Sir Ernest, K.C., M.P. 60  
Wilson, H. 84, 98  
Wilson, H. L. 40, 51, 84, 98  
Wilson, R. K. 42, 51  
Wiseman, C. L. 58, 87, 94  
Wright, Harold 53
- Yeatman, H. M. 25, 40, 51  
Young, Robert, M.P. 46
- Zaidi, B. H. 91, 98

PRINTED BY  
W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.  
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

B165D





University of California  
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY  
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388

Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

**UCLA YRL ILL**

**DUE: ILL - PUL**  
**APR 08 2006**

UCLA ACCESS SERVICES    BL 19  
Interlibrary Loans  
11630 Young Research Library  
BOX 951575  
Los Angeles, CA. 90095-1575



3 1158 01037 286

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 409 605 3



Univ  
Sc  
I